LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
10-30-30
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BT 715 .B3 1930
Barbour, Clifford Edward.
Sin and the new psychology

Sin and the New Psychology

LIBRARY OF PRINCE
OCT 30 193
THEOLOGICAL SEMI

CLIFFORD E. BARBOUR
Ph.D. (Edin.)

1st Church
Knoxville, Tenn.

THE ABINGDON PRESS
NEW YORK CINCINNATI CHICAGO

Copyright, 1930, by
CLIFFORD E. BARBOUR

All rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America

TO THE MEMORY

OF

WILLIAM DICKISON

COUNSELOR AND FRIEND

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
	PREFACE	7
	FOREWORD	9
I.	IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY	11
II.	A SKETCH OF THE NEW PSYCHOLOGY	30
III.	THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF SIN. (The Definition of Sin)	63
IV.	PSYCHIC EVIL AND THE ESSENCE OF SIN. (The Nature of Sin)	88
V.	ORIGINAL SIN AND THE UNITY OF THE RACE. (The Existence of Sin)	115
VI.	TEMPTATION AND THE UNCONSCIOUS IMPULSE. (The Operation of Sin)	142
VII.	THE CONSCIENCE AND AMBIVALENCE (The Recognition of Sin)	163
VIII.	THE SENSE OF GUILT AND THE INFERIORITY COMPLEX. (The Conviction of Sin)	192
IX.	CONFESSION AND REPRESSION. (Turning from Sin)	215
X.	FORGIVENESS AND TRANSFERENCE. (Release from Sin)	236
XI.	SANCTIFICATION AND SUBLIMATION. (Freedom from Sin)	255

PREFACE

Present-day psychologists may be grouped according to the direction in which they are moving. There is a large group which is treading the old path that leads to pure mechanism. This group conceives of man as being nothing more than matter. He is not an indomitable soul, but an incompetent body. He is a robot, to be perfected by organization, the organization of society and the organization of the individual's responses. This is the path of the Behaviorists.

The other group has been sailing an uncharted sea. Under different leaders, all have been moving toward the discovery of a new continent in the world of man's mind, that which will reveal the cause of his purposive strivings. Those who have made the first contacts in that continent, now known as the unconscious, have described its nature in various ways, but they merely present different aspects of the same thing. It is with this group that this study is concerned. These are the new psychologists, for they are dealing with something which is a possession of our generation but which was unknown in the past.

Because they are dealing with that which is new these psychologists have disturbed much of that which is old. Problems have arisen out of what are considered to be conflicting concepts. I have concerned myself here with one of these problems, and with only one.

It was suggested to me as a fruitful field for study by the Very Rev. W. P. Paterson, D.D., formerly Dean of the Divinity School of the University of Edinburgh, Scotland, to whom I feel greatly indebted both for the suggestion and for his helpful and kindly advice. I wish to express my deep gratitude to the Rev. Professor Hugh R. Mackintosh, D.D., Litt.D., of New College, Edinburgh, who has written a gracious foreword, and who counseled with me in the consideration of the problem. Principal T. H. Hughes, of the Congregational College, Edinburgh, aided me greatly by criticizing my elaboration of the theme. My sincere appreciation is due Judge L. H. Spilman, of Knoxville, Tennessee, for his careful reading of the proof.

CLIFFORD E. BARBOUR.

FOREWORD

It is all to the good that so wise and well-informed a treatment of topics now being ever more widely canvassed, should be placed before the world. Doctor Barbour has confronted, not with denunciation but with reasoned argument, the fairly common view that there is no such thing as sin in the Christian sense, because "complexes" now are all. So far from an internecine conflict obtaining between Christian teaching about sin and the New Psychology (taken as equivalent to psychoanalysis), he urges that in a real degree they are pursuing the same end. The method of psychotherapy, as he contends, is in principle identical with that which Christianity employs for the cure and eradication of sin. Psychic evil (or moral disease) and sin are not the same; but, as is here shown, a real and sympathetic comparison can be drawn between the redemptive proposals of the Christian gospel and the process of psychoanalysis.

It is in the light of this large and impressive hypothesis that Doctor Barbour treats of such cardinal topics in moral psychology as temptation and the unconscious, conscience and

ambivalence, the inferiority complex, repression, transference, and sublimation. In a way that is fascinating as well as luminous he proves in detail how these modern terms in great measure represent a translation, into the technical language of present-day psychology, of ideas which Christian thinkers have long been accustomed to use in describing the nature of sin, its recognition and confession by the sinner, and the escape from sin afforded by forgiveness and sanctification. He may thus be said to have made good his early claim, namely, that recent psychology is a new witness to the truth of Christ. Psychoanalysis is bent on aiding man to harmony within himself and in his finite environment; Christianity goes further, and seeks to cure sin by putting him right with God.

Doctor Barbour writes with knowledge, as well as with a quiet force that may be trusted to win the reader's confidence. He wastes no words and has a way of keeping to the point. There must be many who will gladly accept his guidance in their reflections on a subject not merely of contemporary interest, but of fundamental religious importance, both in theory and practice.

H. R. Mackintosh.

New College, Edinburgh.

CHAPTER I

IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

A. The Christian Concept of Sin Is Basic in Any Consideration of the Meaning of the Christian Religion

Christianity is a practical religion. Everything in it is connected more or less directly with the consideration of the needs of man and the means with which to meet those needs. To be sure, it has developed an elaborate system of metaphysics and an intricate and involved theology, but its metaphysics and its theology are developed out of the realization of man's need. The Christian system of metaphysics is divided into the departments of Theology, Anthropology, Soteriology, and Eschatology. The last three departments deal wholly with the nature of man, his need for redemption, the method of attaining salvation, and the consequence resulting upon the acceptance or the rejection of the method. Theoretically, of course, theology proper, the first department, should deal only with the nature and attributes of God and therefore would have nothing to say of man's need for God,

or his relationship to God. But, practically, the study of theology leads to the examination of the nature of God expressing itself through the attributes of God in his decrees and in his providence. These latter elements in the study deal very definitely with man's relationship to God and lead directly to the consideration of man's separation from God, because of his refusal to accept the decrees or to be guided by the providence.

Christian philosophers and theologians recognize that it is man's need which lies at the heart of their systems of thought. Now, man's need is for perfect fellowship with God. Since man first became man it has been his desire to bring his own soul into harmony with the reality behind the universe. This desire was awakened and has been fostered and developed, not through a passion for abstract truth, so much as because of man's longing to learn the explanation of his own existence and the purpose of his own life. The great religions of the world are built up around the theory of this purpose and the program for its fulfillment. Hinduism says that the purpose of man's life is to become absorbed in Brahma, the world spirit. Buddhism says it is the attainment of Nirvana, the blessed existence when desire no longer motivates life. The Christian says,

"The chief end of man is to glorify God and to enjoy him forever"—to have perfect communion with the Eternal Father. In his present state man does not have that fellowship. The failure arises out of his refusal to submit his will to the divine purpose and to mold his life according to the divine plan. This is sin. Any failure to live according to God's purpose, any deviation from his plan, is sin, and it is sin which separates man from God.

If sin, then, is what keeps man from enjoying intimate fellowship with God, and thus from realizing the purpose of his existence, the redemption from sin and continuous freedom from sin will bring about that communion. This is the essence of Christianity. This is the foundation upon which the structure of the Christian religion is built. Christ taught that the way of forgiveness, of freedom, and of fellowship, is through love, perfect love to God and perfect love for man. In one awful moment on the cross he revealed the yearning of God for that love. And with his own love he bridged the gap between God and man, a cleavage wrought by the destructive work of sin. A recognition of man's need because of his sin and the way of redemption through Christ are at the center of Christianity, and are the reason for the existence of Christian

theology, with its explanation of the nature of God, the need of man, and the redemption to be found through Christ.

B. Sin Is Also a Practical Question of Life

Sin is not merely basic in the theoretical consideration of the meaning of Christianity. It is also basic in considering the problems of everyday life. If we were not interested in its nature and in the way out of sin from the point of view of the religious needs of man's soul, we should be interested because of the practical needs of his life. Man's political life, his economic life, and his social life are all deeply affected by his adherence, or lack of adherence, to the divine purpose and the divine plan.

For example, business is not conducted primarily for the attainment of an ideal social order, but for profit. A man engages in business, not to make the world better, but to make money. Yet business is very keenly interested in the morals of men. Commercial reasons alone are sufficient to cause an industrial concern to be interested in the ethical life of its employees. It is for commercial reasons that a business house is careful to choose for its sales force men of high character. Every financial institution must protect itself against fraud,

dishonesty, and embezzlement. The violation of one of the three commandments, "Thou shalt not kill," "Thou shalt not steal," "Thou shalt not commit adultery," will deprive most men and women of the right to obtain life insurance. Business, legitimate business, does not want to have dealings with sinners. It costs too much.

What is true of business is true of our communal life at large. It is the sinner in society that keeps the world from freedom, peace, and happiness. He is the reason for the existence of jails and police courts, of almshouses and asylums. He costs every civilized state in protective, preventive, and punitive measures more than the combined amounts expended on religion, education, and recreation. This does not mean only the criminal in the civil sense, but also the sinner in the religious sense. For there is many a man who could not be convicted of crime before the law, who is yet a sinner before God, and who, because of his sin, is an irritant that constantly festers society.

The most vexing problems man has to face in his everyday life are the problems born of sin. Because these are also the problems which affect most deeply his abiding personality, it is essential that we discover the cause of sin, the nature and operation of sin, and, if possible, learn the cure for sin.

C. The Christian Concept of Sin Is Being Questioned

This study is especially necessary at the present time because the Christian concept of sin is being questioned. The feeling is gaining wide acceptance that there is no such thing as sin in the Christian sense. Evil, it is said, may encompass a man's life and bring disaster to his personality, but it is not sin. It is psychic evil that can be explained by psychical causes and perhaps cured by psychological therapy. There are many who say that evil is caused by the ill fortune of a man's heritage and the accident of his environment. A man is born with a certain equipment of instincts native to all the members of his species, but the psychic energy that accompanies these instincts varies considerably among the individuals who compose the race, and is the result of one's particular heritage. This energy must find some outlet either in free or in sublimated expression of the instincts. When the environment into which a person is born forbids free expression to the instincts, or when lack of education or improper direction circumvents the possibility of the sublimation of the instincts, a conflict ensues which may result in repression. Psychic energy must find expression, and, while it can be forbidden certain modes of activity, it does not cease to

act in some way, and unconscious complexes may result causing all manner of psychic evil to the individual.

This theory has led many to say that "nothing is right and nothing is wrong. Everything is the result of complexes." It has resulted in an easy tolerance of sin. It has relieved some of a troublesome sense of responsibility and a depressing feeling of guilt. An individual is not held to be responsible when his heritage and environment are against him, nor is he to be commended when they are in his favor. He is born with an inheritance of weakness or of strength beyond his control. He is placed in a situation he cannot change. There is, therefore, no praise for him who attains to the heights of group morality and no condemnation for him who fails. A man succeeds or fails according to his native endowment and the help or hindrance of his environment.

Many psychologists have been led by their theory into this form of determinism. The behaviorists are the most purely deterministic, and hold the belief that every thought and deed, every nerve response, and every psychical and physical action is definitely the result of discoverable causes beyond the control of the individual. They assert that when we know the exact nature of a particular human organ-

ism, we can predict with absolute accuracy every response to every stimulus. One of their most active protagonists puts the results of his arguments in these conclusions, "We thus see that . . . definite factors are always present which rationalize behavior and give it a causal basis," and later in the same paragraph, "Psychologically, the individual can act only in line with his training and in conformity with his inherited points of weakness and strength."[1]

We expect this from the materialistic philosophy which guides the behaviorists, but we are somewhat surprised to find it in the purposive psychology of the psychoanalysts. Here too there is a determinism that goes beyond what Tansley defines as, "The doctrine that every phenomenon is caused."[2] Tansley's definition does not limit man's moral freedom. It includes self-determination through the power of the consciousness to direct life, as well as the more uncontrollable determinism resulting from psychical heritage and previously formed habit responses. Nor does it limit

[1] Watson, *Psychology From the Standpoint of a Behaviorist*, p. 321. Reprinted by permission of J. B. Lippincott Company, publishers, New York.

[2] Tansley, *The New Psychology* (Fifth Edition, London, 1922), p. 299. Reprinted by permission of George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., London.

man's moral responsibility. But the determinism originally proposed by Freud and accepted by many other psychoanalysts as a primary truth of man's psychic constitution does not include self-determination. Freud proposes three results of scientific study that have sorely wounded the arrogance of man. The first, he says, was the proof of the Copernican theory that the earth is not the center of the universe. This was the cosmological blow. The second was the discovery by Darwin that man is not really divided from the animal world, but has an affinity with it, and is the result of its evolution. This he calls the biological blow. He goes on to say that the third and most bitter blow of all to hurt human vanity is the discovery by the psychoanalysts that "the ego is not master in its own house,"[3] which he calls the psychological blow. This is pure determinism, and is contrary to the most cherished beliefs of ethical mankind.

[3] Freud, *Collected Papers*, vol. iv, pp. 347-56, and *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, p. 241. Freud overstates his own proposal when he says, concerning man's affinity with the animals, p. 352, that "man is not a being different from animals, or superior to them," for in another place (Intro. Lect., p. 346) he suggests that man's "superiority over the other animals may come down to his capacity for neurosis," at once admitting the superiority of man, and stating wherein it consists. Reprinted by permission of Horace Liveright, publisher, New York.

No mere polemic against those findings of psychology which seem contradictory to some orthodox doctrines of Christianity will stem the tide of psychological truth which is sweeping over the world, and would be no aid in the progress of theology. Christianity must recognize truth in whatever guise it presents itself. Its purpose is to set man free through truth. Certainly, any theology that seeks to be vital in these days must acknowledge and use scientific truth even at the expense of the most cherished ecclesiastical dogma and tradition. If psychological determinism is true, we must accept it. Certainly, much that we do is the result of causes over which we have but little control, and few would deny the measure of truth in this new presentation of the old theory of *necessity controlled* action. However, a docile acceptance of unwarranted generalizations would be disastrous. And the statement that "the ego is not master in its own house," is an unwarranted generalization. Freud disproves his own position. He states that the method of treatment in psychoanalysis is "to make the unconscious conscious."[4] "Our therapy," he says, "does its work by transforming something unconscious into something conscious, and only succeeds in its work in so far as it is able

[4] Freud, *Collected Papers*, vol. i, p. 269.

to effect this transformation."[5] Every time he cures a patient, therefore, Freud repudiates his own theory and gives definite evidence of man's capacity for self-determination, and the possibility of the ego being master in its own house. Freud also offers another argument supporting man's power of self-determination in his theory of sublimation. He says that man is able to redirect the power accompanying his instinctive impulses in sublimated form, and thus to use their psychic energy for the good of the race and for the development of his own soul. If Freud is right in these things, then he is wrong in his determinism.

If the theory is true that our whole life is guided by the chance element in our heritage and the accident of our environment, then the way to overcome evil and secure complete self-realization for the individual and social ideality for the group, is to direct heritage and to change environment. Yet Sparta was not highly successful in producing a superman by the control of his heritage, and there is no indication, notwithstanding our greater knowledge as to ways and means of directing such heritage, that we will be any more successful.

[5] Freud, *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, p. 237. Reprinted by permission of George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., London.

The change in heritage we need most is to become the children of God. Nor will a change in our environment effect a transformation. If a man is a sinner in the West End, it will not make him a saint to move him to the East End —to change his address. The only change in environment that will bring the proper effect in a sinner and will take evil out of his life is for him to move into the presence of God.

We cannot get rid of sin by denying it any more than we can get rid of dirt by ignoring it, or pain by bearing it. There was a time when a calm stoicism toward physical ills and pains was advocated, partly because there was no cure, and partly because it was considered a discipline necessary to the development of strong character. To-day no doctor will prescribe a course in stoic fortitude as a cure for sickness. The existence throughout the world of institutes for research and the study of human ailments, together with the careful systematic investigation being carried on in the fields of genetics and eugenics, witness to the earnest effort of man to guide himself into more abundant life. No longer is practiced without objection the easy method of relieving society of the mentally diseased by labeling them deficient and segregating them in detention homes when violent, or accepting them as

necessary evils in community life when harmless. To-day there is a consistent effort on the part of intelligent mankind to rid itself of the causes rather than merely the symptoms of mental and physical evil. This must also be the program of Christianity. We cannot forget sin—it makes itself too strongly felt in our individual and in our group life. We cannot be content to free ourselves from the symptom, a sense of guilt, by some fantastic formula of forgiveness. We must cleanse the race of the cause and the effect of sin by the application of the principles proposed in the New Testament and now supported by the scientific discoveries of the new psychology.

D. There Is No Essential Conflict Between Christianity and the New Psychology

This apparently irreconcilable antagonism between psychological determinism and the Christian concept of the freedom of the will is not an essential conflict. It is a part of a larger controversy concerning the definition of the nature of the psyche, or soul, of man, a controversy that likewise is unnecessary. The psychologist insists that man's soul is rooted in his animal nature. The Christian contends that man was made to be like God. The psychol-

ogist asserts that man is essentially of the earth earthy. The Christian says that heaven is his home.

It will be seen that the problem resolves itself into a matter of viewpoint, a limited viewpoint in the case of the psychologist, and too often equally limited on the part of the Christian. Neither is looking at the whole personality of man. The psychologist may be right, and the roots of man's soul may be buried deep in his animal nature and bound to the things of the earth. But to limit oneself to the point of view of the roots is to limit oneself indeed. The roots of the flower look out on mud and slime and slippery crawling things, but the lily is embraced by the velvet touch of pure air, enlivened by refreshing rains, and glorified in the warm love of the sun. To see only the roots is to completely misunderstand the reason for their existence, and to miss the beauty of the flower. Perhaps the roots of humanity also look out on an unlovely scene and psychology has helped us to know the roots and the nature of the soil in which they grow. To know only his roots, however, is to misunderstand the reason for man's existence. The root is not all. Man was not made to be a root in the mud. He was made to blossom in the presence of God. This limited viewpoint of

the psychologist keeps him from having a comprehensive knowledge of the whole of man. Christianity also has frequently had a limited vision. The Christian has seen only the flower. He has considered the roots as evils to be dug up and destroyed, that the beauty of the blossom might be freed from contact with their ugliness, forgetting that they are a part of the whole plant and essential to its growth. It is only as the roots are enlivened that the flower blooms—"First . . . that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual."[6] Until the Christian knows the nature of man's roots and the earth that gives them growth, he can do little to develop the bloom. Christianity needs, to use a phrase coined by Professor J. Douglas Adam, "a redistribution of emphasis in its theology." It needs a reconsideration of the whole nature of man, of that in him which is earthly as well as that which is divine. There is then no real conflict. There is a difference in point of view, a difference that can be reconciled when both Christianity and psychology enlarge their outlook and know man both in his origins and in his possibilities, in what he has been and what he may become.

In a general way the aims of the new psychology and the aims of Christianity are the

[6] 1 Cor. 15. 46.

same. Both seek abundant life for the individual and ideal social life for the group. The psychologist asserts that abundant life comes with the free use of the psychic energy accompanying instinct impulses, in a manner that will not conflict with accepted herd standards or normal personal inhibitions. In our modern social life this means that most of this energy must be expended in sublimated form and the consequent divergence of much of it from the ordinary instinctive channels. This divergence is an aid in the creation of ideal social life for the group through the medium of art, literature, religion, education, recreation, social service, and many other avenues of effort. When the right balance is attained between satisfaction of the individual's instinct impulses and the realization of ideal social intercourse through the altruistic channels of culture, then the aims of the new psychology for full life for the individual and ideal social life for the group will be effected. On the other hand, Christianity insists that abundant life belongs only to those who have perfect fellowship with God through Christ, and ideal social life can belong only to that group which is composed of those who know the abundant life and are for that reason members of the kingdom of God.

While the Christian conception is of an ideal

condition which may seem visionary, yet the psychological goal is a progressive one, which, followed logically, must approximate to the Christian concept, if it does not in reality attain to that ideal. With the creation of higher social ideals through the sublimation of the instinct energy of the individuals composing a group, still higher standards of useful living will be created, which in turn will necessitate the further sublimation of instinct energy to realize. The progression must continue until the perfect ideal of individual and social life is reached. This will come when man is in complete harmony with ultimate reality, or, in Christian terminology, when he is in perfect communion with God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. There is apparently, therefore, no real conflict in the aims of Christianity and of the new psychology.

Not only do Christianity and psychology have the same general aims, but the psychologist in dealing with mental or moral evil uses the same methods the Christian uses to combat sin.[7] The psychological explanation of the cause of psychic evil and the Christian theory of the source of sin in the individual life are

[7] It is the methods which are alike. Sin and psychological evil are not to be identified. The differentiation is made in Chapters III and IV.

fundamentally the same. The difference is largely in nomenclature. This is also true of the psychological therapy for curing diseased minds and the Christian doctrine of forgiveness and sanctification for the healing of sick souls. The psychologist says that lack of proper guidance in the use of instinct power leads to failure in adaptation to the realities of life, which results in repressions, and the unconscious complexes thus generated end in a neurosis which is a state of mental and moral disease. The Christian declares that lack of proper guidance in the development of spiritual power leads the individual to reject the ideal that is in Christ, and results in his inability to find fellowship with God, or perfect adaptation to ultimate reality. This rejection ends in spiritual atrophy. The cure for psychological evil is wrought through the recognition of the cause leading to the lack of adaptation and the resulting repressions and neurosis, facing the demands of reality in oneself and one's environment, and, usually under the guidance of the psychophysician, the redirection of psychic energy in a way that will satisfy one's own instinct impulses, and at the same time conform to the demands of society, which process is continued until complete self-integration is achieved. Freedom from sin is attained, according to the Christian

doctrine, by first recognizing the existence of and the cause for sin, and subsequent repentance and acceptance of the guidance of Christ in sanctification. This process will use natural impulses for the accomplishment of spiritual ends until freedom from sin is attained and perfect fellowship with God acquired. It is my purpose to show that the method used by psychoanalysis in the treatment of psychical evil is the same in principle as that which throughout the centuries the Christian has used to combat sin.

This book, then, is not an apologetic for the Christian doctrine of sin, but is an effort to show that no such apologetic is necessary. Psychology, like the other sciences, has merely added the weight of its evidence to prove the eternal verity of the doctrines of Christ.

CHAPTER II

A SKETCH OF THE NEW PSYCHOLOGY

A. By the New Psychology Is Meant Psychoanalysis

By the new psychology I mean psychoanalysis. For psychoanalysis is the modern development furthest removed from orthodox psychology and also that which, with the application of scientific methods, has enriched to the greatest extent our knowledge of the psychic nature of man. The methods of psychoanalysis as it deals with psychical evil are the same general methods as used by Christianity to contend with sin. Yet it is psychoanalysis which is most responsible for the current feeling of the unreality of sin. This new science has again raised the old question.

Janet, one of the earliest of the new psychologists, says: "Psychoanalysis is not an ordinary psychological analysis that attempts to discover any phenomena whatsoever and the laws of these phenomena. It is a criminal investigation that must find a guilty party, a past event responsible for present troubles, which recognizes it and pursues it under all its

disguises."[1] It is for this reason that psychoanalysis is of paramount interest in this study. We also are in search of a guilty party. We want to know the cause for sin, the nature of sin, and the way to be rid of sin.

Academic psychology, as such, cannot help us in our search, for it has limited itself very largely to the observable facts of the conscious minds of normal persons. Consequently, it throws no light on the conflicts existing within the mind; conflicts, for example, between an ego life purpose and the unconscious impulses, or between the reality principle as the guide of life and the pleasure principle. These conflicts are the chief concern of the psychoanalysts, and they are also of primary importance to us, for it is out of such conflicts that sin emerges.

Nor do the psychiatrists give us much light. Until recent years, "With few exceptions they accepted the structuralist theory that all disease of the mind is primarily disease of the brain. At the present time . . . the majority probably assign only a very small proportion of the disorders in which they are practically interested to the psychogenic group."[2] They are inter-

[1] Janet, *Principles of Psycho-Therapy*, p. 274. Reprinted by permission of The Macmillan Company, publishers, New York.

[2] McDougall, *Outline of Abnormal Psychology*, p. 2. Reprinted by permission of Charles Scribner's Sons, publishers, New York.

ested in the cure of mental evil, but because they "recognize only a psychology of consciousness,"[3] they have no therapy for psychic evil that has its source in the unconscious mind. They seek to explain such evil on a structuralist basis. The great difference between psychiatry and psychoanalysis is the difference in consideration of the nature of a symptom. The psychiatrist considers the symptom the result of the disease. The psychoanalyst considers it the expression of the disease, and therefore studies the observable symptom that he may seek out its hidden cause. His treatment consists in bringing about the conscious recognition of the unconscious source of the mental evil, and the redirection of its energy by the consciousness toward satisfactory ends. The impulses arising out of the unconscious are not in themselves sinful, but they provide much of the material of sin and the energy for sin. Their activity must therefore be known by the Christian student of sin. If psychiatry does not have an adequate therapy for treating mental evil having its source in the unconscious, its principles will be of little aid to a competent understanding of the nature of sin.

The behaviorists offer us nothing. They are the present-day adherents to the doctrine of

[3] Freud, *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, p. 235.

physical monism as the basis of personality. They hold that what others term conscious and unconscious are but varying degrees of nerve activity. Mind is merely matter. Thinking is only nascent action. Will is nerve response. "States of consciousness," says Watson, "are not objectively verifiable, and for that reason can never become data for science."[4] In another place he adds, "Psychologically, man is still a reacting piece of unanalyzed protoplasm."[5] That is, man is only an automaton under the haphazard guidance of forces and stimuli from without acting upon nerve responses, motor reactions, and gland secretions within. Behaviorist psychology has made the mistake of studying only effects rather than affects, results rather than causes. They have examined the surface of the rug and sought to explain the weaving by the pattern. Their empirical observations unballasted by philosophic reasonings have carried them to false conclusions. Surely, to use McDougall's words, "Any picture of the universe which leaves out the purposive mental activity which creates that picture is a little naïve, and even ridiculous."[6] And Hocking suggests that, "We can

[4] Watson, *Psychology From the Standpoint of a Behaviorist*, p. 1.
[5] Watson, *Ibid.*, p. 6.
[6] McDougall, *Outline of Abnormal Psychology*, p. 521.

derive the whole set of behavior phenomena in principle from the demands of consciousness; but we cannot in turn derive the fact nor the need of conscious life from the principles of the bodily organism and its world."[7]

The conclusions of the behaviorists can be of no help to us, therefore, because their premises are wrong. If man has not the power of choice, there may be either good or evil, but there is no such thing as right and wrong. If man has no recourse but to respond to stimuli according to the demands of his inherited tendencies and according to the pattern of his past experience rather than according to the free choice of his own will, then man is neither innocent nor guilty. He is merely fortunate or unfortunate. Then man is not mind, but matter. He has not a will to act, but merely a way of acting. He is not an indomitable soul, but an incompetent body.

So we confine ourselves to the consideration of the methods and conclusions of psychoanalysis as they bear on our conception of the Christian doctrine of sin. This new development of psychology has wrought a great change in the ethical thinking of the world, and there

[7] Hocking, *Human Nature and Its Remaking*, p. 478. Reprinted by permission of Yale University Press, publishers, New Haven.

are many who believe that its discoveries have abrogated the moral and religious standards of Christianity. It is hoped that this study may be able to show that psychoanalysis actually offers confirmatory evidence to the teaching of the Christian Church regarding the nature and action of sin and the method of achieving freedom from sin.

B. Contributions of Psychoanalysis

Perhaps the best-known contribution to modern thought made by the psychoanalysts is the one upon which its entire system has been built up, the revelation of the existence and nature of that tremendous storehouse and power plant of the human mind, the unconscious. The psychoanalysts' method of examining the human psyche to rid it of hampering evil forced them to recognize a hidden or subconscious store of knowledge and source of power, exerting a profound influence upon the direction of man's life. This has been quite generally called the unconscious. According to its great leader, "As a science, psychoanalysis is characterized by the methods with which it works, not by the subject matter with which it deals."[8] Nevertheless, through its methods it has thrown much light upon the nature and operation of

[8] Freud, *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, p. 325.

the subject matter with which it deals. While it "aims at and achieves nothing more than the discovery of the unconscious in mental life,"[9] in so doing, it has revealed the dread power of an undirected unconscious in controlling both the mental and physical life of man, and it has shown the absolute necessity for the direction of this unconscious power by the conscious mind if mental health is to be maintained. An uncontrolled unconscious means abnormality.

The nature of the unconscious is variously defined by the several schools of psychoanalysis. Freud limits its content to repressions. Because of the nature of its content, according to Freud, its effect on the psychic life of the individual is usually harmful. If the unconscious is the storehouse for repressions that have emerged out of conflicts between the ego ideal and the instinct impulses, especially since there also exists energy that must find expression, the unconscious must be the seat of all emotional stress, obsessional acts, and the neuroses. Because of this limitation, Freud is forced to postulate what he calls the foreconscious for the great mass of psychic material which is not the result of repressions and yet which is not at the command of the conscious mind. It is conceived of as a sort of purgatory

[9] Freud, *Ibid.*, p. 325.

where some impulses can be made fit for conscious expression, while others remain unredeemed, or are banished into the lower regions of the unconscious. Jung says, "In my view, the unconscious is a psychological boundary-concept, which covers all those psychic contents or processes which are not conscious, i. e., *not related to the ego in a perceptible way.*"[10] This comprehensive definition includes forgotten material lost in a normal way, as well as repressions. It includes also "sense-perceptions which, either because of their slight intensity or because of the deviation of attention, do not attain to conscious apperception, none the less become psychic contents through unconscious apperception."[11] In addition there exist associations in the unconscious that are the inherited equipment of the race, part of which is the natural heritage we receive as human animals, and part Jung believes to be the inheritable accumulated experience of preceding generations. Jung's concept is the most generally accepted. Tansley has put it in a simple definition that will serve us in this study. He says that the unconscious is "the

---

[10] Jung, *Psychological Types*, p. 613. (The italics are his.) Reprinted by permission of Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc., publishers, New York.

[11] Jung, *Introducing Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, p. 615.

part of the mind whose contents are not directly accessible to consciousness." [12]

The discovery of the nature and the power of the unconscious has led to a popular notion that, "Man's behavior is to be explained on an unconscious emotional rather than a conscious rational basis."[13] The psychoanalysts have never taught any such idea. Freud says, "Unconsciousness is only one attribute of the mental and by no means suffices to describe its character."[14] As was pointed out in the preceding chapter, every time the therapy of psychoanalysis is applied and effects a cure, there is presented conclusive evidence of the power of the "conscious rational" element in man's mental make-up to direct his life. This revelation of the power of the consciousness to redirect unconscious impulses and their accompanying power toward higher ends is another contribution of psychoanalysis. It is perhaps the most vital discovery of all, for it points the way to progressive development. The nature of the unconscious taken alone is depressing to contemplate, but if through sublimation we can consciously redirect its psychic energy for worthy ends, it gives us a hopeful outlook.

---

[12] Tansley, *The New Psychology*, p. 301, see also pp. 51-56.
[13] Swisher, Atlantic Monthly, November, 1926.
[14] Freud, *Collected Papers*, vol. iv, p. 104.

The "conscious rational" and the "unconscious emotional" elements are generally in conflict. The cause of this conflict lies in the differing demands for satisfaction made by the two elements. The conscious, being what Freud calls, "The coherent ego,"[15] has a life purpose and a life plan for its attainment, whereas the unconscious is hedonistic, demanding expression for its natural instincts and satisfaction for repressed desires. When expression for the instincts and satisfaction for the repressed desires are inconsistent with the life purpose or contrary to the life plan of the coherent ego, a psychic conflict results. The new psychology has revealed the nature of this conflict and has shown the evil that may issue from the failure to harmonize the contrasting impulses and ideals. It has also demonstrated that the way to mental concord is by acknowledging the reality of the unconscious demands, satisfying them through sublimated activity, and redirecting their surplus psychic energy toward the accomplishment of the ego ideal.

These discoveries by the psychoanalysts of the interaction of the unconscious and the conscious minds, the conflicts and the evils which sometimes emerge, have led to the development of a method of treatment for the cure of the evil

[15] Freud, *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, p. 19.

and the restoration of mental health. This therapy might be regarded as one of their greatest contributions. It is remarkable that it proves to be an almost perfect parallel to the Christian method of acquiring freedom from sin.[16]

An excellent criterion of the influence upon our life of a discovery or a fresh development in science is the number of new words brought into the language of a people by the discovery or the development. The increase in the use of electricity, the progress in the science of aeronautics, and the rapid advance of radio-telephony have greatly enlarged our vocabulary. A list of the words, some new and others with new meanings, introduced into common usage by the discoveries and the technique of the psychoanalysts partly demonstrates the measure of their gifts to the thought of our age: the unconscious, regression, repression, complex, obsession, phantasy, libido, psychic energy, psychic projection, identification, transference, extrovert, introvert, affect, dissociation, self-realization, integration, sublimation.

C. The Psychoanalysts

Psychoanalysis is not so much a new science as a new method, a method of utilizing in the

[16] See p. 17.

treatment of mental disease the results of modern research into the structure of the human mind. It is a method also which has itself made important additions to the store of our knowledge of man. We must recognize that it is an unfinished chapter in an incomplete book, being written by a group of authors who have had only a minimum of collaboration. But every new scientific discovery or practice, however undeveloped, or capable of further development, has an effect on the progressing intellectual life of an age, and it is well to get a picture of that influence. Radio transmission and modern rapid transportation by earth, air, and water, are by no means in a finished stage, but they are exerting a tremendous power in our life and are bringing about radical changes in our civilization. So it is with psychoanalysis. It is effecting great transformations in our thinking about ourselves, so that with some it has even been used as the basis for a completely new philosophy of life. It is well that we have some acquaintance with this new force. I propose, therefore, to present briefly the theories of psychoanalysis as published by a few of its leading exponents and practitioners.

Pierre Janet. Pierre Janet, of Salpetrière, France, opened the door that led from the animal magnetism of an earlier psychological

practice to the psychoanalysis of to-day, though he himself has never really crossed the threshold. He stands between the old and the new. He was a pupil of Charcot, his predecessor at Salpetrière, who departed from the use of pure animal magnetism in his treatment of hysteria to what Bernheim pointed out was suggestive hypnotism.[17] Janet has advanced considerably upon the work of his master, but he has not been willing to go all the way with the psychoanalysts. His theory of psychic energy is an atomic theory. He teaches that the flow of psychic energy can be described as the cohering flow of atoms in the stream of consciousness in a normal person, or the disconnected flow of the same kind of atoms in the stream of consciousness of an abnormal person. He also fails to recognize the power of repressions to break up the flow and thus to produce disintegration. Yet Freud gives him credit for having first published the idea that neurotic symptoms are the expression of the unconscious.[18] He himself takes credit for much more. He tells of a visit he had from Freud in 1889 and complains that his theories were accepted

---

[17] Quoted by Janet, *Principles of Psycho-Therapy*, p. 27. Reprinted by permission of The Macmillan Company, publishers, New York.

[18] Freud, *Introductory Lectures*, p. 218.

by the Austrian physician and labeled with different names. "What I had called psychological-analysis, he called psychoanalysis: what I called psychological-system, . . . he called complex: he considered a repression what I considered a restriction of consciousness: what I referred to as psychological dissociation, he baptized with the name of catharsis. But, above all, he transformed a clinical observation and a therapeutical treatment with a definite and limited field of use into an enormous system of medical philosophy."[19] He suggests that psychoanalysis has been too radical and predicts its failure. He says: "Psychoanalysis is to-day the last incarnation of those practices at once magical and psychological that characterized magnetism. . . . It is probable that it will also meet with undeserved appreciation and decline; but, like magnetism and hypnotism, it will have played a great rôle and will have given a useful impulse to the study of psychology."[20]

Janet's psychological system is built upon the theory that all neuroses and psychic evils result from a poverty of psychic energy due either to small endowment or to wastage

---

[19] Janet, *Principles of Psycho-Therapy*, pp. 41-42. Reprinted by permission of The Macmillan Company, publishers, New York.

[20] Janet, *Ibid.*, p. 42.

through excessive emotional responses to stimuli. His therapy consists in using various kinds of suggestions to stimulate the memory, sensibility, and emotion of the patient to redirected activity. He himself recognizes the inconsistency between his theory and his practice, and admits that "it seems odd to try to cure exhausted individuals by making them work and to avoid bankruptcy by advising new outlays."[21] The inconsistency, however, is more apparent than real, for it is the outlay of energy in the wrong direction that causes the bankruptcy, and redirection is all that is necessary for a return to the normal. Janet's great difference in therapy from the psychoanalysts is his use of suggestion. The psychoanalyst helps the patient to see for himself what is wrong. Janet points out what he should see. The psychoanalyst lets his patient choose his own method of sublimation. Janet suggests what would be best.

The weakness in Janet's system is his failure to recognize the power of mental conflicts to cause psychical troubles. His "restriction of consciousness" is negative, while the conflict between the ego and the ego ideal, conceived by the psychoanalysts to be the cause of the unconscious complexes, is a positive force. As

[21] Janet, *Principles of Psycho-Therapy*, p. 288.

pointed out by McDougall, "The advance of the psychoanalysts beyond Janet's position consists essentially in a fuller recognition of this truth."[22]

Sigmund Freud. Sigmund Freud was the founder and is the great leader of the several schools of psychoanalysis. He made the first step away from the sensationist and mechanistic psychology of the older schools and set the standard certainly for one great trend of modern thought concerning the nature of man's mind.

He evolved his psychological system, perhaps under the stimulus of Janet's views, until he developed what McDougall has called a "hormic" psychology. "That is to say, Freud aligned himself with that tradition in psychology known as voluntarism, which comes down from Aristotle, . . . the tradition which sees the most fundamental characteristic of men and animals in their purposive striving toward ends or goals."[23] The greatest influence toward the accomplishment of these ends is the power of the instincts, which, again, in our modern understanding of them, bears the stamp of Freud's ingenuity. The older psychology considered the instincts as nerve-paths of action

[22] McDougall, *Outline of Abnormal Psychology*, p. 16.
[23] McDougall, *Ibid.*, p. 19.

created by the habit forms of the race, resulting in tendencies to act in certain ways by the individual members of the species. Freud says that an instinct is far more. It is a striving toward a certain goal or goals, involving the interplay of mind and muscle and the activity of the whole man, and is expressed in a great variety of complex impulses and actions. However, the impulses are curbed and the actions are regulated in their complexity by the intelligence of the individual stimulated, following upon his apprehension of the circumstances surrounding the stimulus which called the instinct into activity, an understanding of the results that would follow the various courses of behavior possible, together with an appreciation of the degree in which these results would aid or hinder the attainment of the final goal.

This conception is an outgrowth of Freud's continuous experimental study. In his earlier publications he implied that man was mostly guided by his instinct impulses, and when these conflicted with his social, religious, or philosophical code of life, the impulses were repressed and some measure of psychic evil resulted. In his later works, however, particularly in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*,[24] he suggested that a "reality principle," or ego

[24] London, 1922.

ideal, a conscious life purpose, perhaps has most to do with man's psychic development. When this reality principle is used by the conscious mind to direct the action of the instincts toward the accomplishment of the goal for the whole life, mental health is assured. But when it is used to curb the action of the instincts and to repress their impulses, their energy, despite the barrier erected, continues to find expression: in the average person in dreams and phantasies, in slips of the tongue and hand, and in various little habitual and somewhat ceremonial acts; and in the neurotic patient, in his symptoms.

It is thus seen, according to Freud, that all manner of psychical harm results from repressions growing out of the conflict between the natural instinct impulses and the reality principle of the consciousness, a conflict which is unnecessary. The method of clearing away the psychic difficulty is to get rid of the conflict. Freud does this by "making the unconscious conscious;"[25] that is, by clearing away the repressions. This can be accomplished forever by lowering the ego ideal to the plane of the instincts, or by guiding the expression of the instincts toward the attainment of the ego ideal. Freud leaves the choice of the method

[25] Freud, *Introductory Lectures*, p. 237.

to his patients, insisting that a choice must be made and harmony secured before mental health can be achieved. One thing or the other must be done, because complete victory for the instincts, if won at the expense of the ego ideal, is as evil in its consequence as victory for the ego ideal if gained through repression of the instinct impulses. "An effective decision can be reached only when they confront each other on the same ground."[26] Psychologically, "free living" is as bad as overascetic living. Harmony is essential, harmony within oneself and harmony with one's environment.

The fundamental defect in Freud's system is the weight he gives to the power of the sexual instinct in the direction of life. Every new discovery he makes in psychoanalytic treatment he accommodates to his hypothesis that the sexual motive (using his meaning of the term to include all manifestations of love) is the basic motive in all of man's progression or regression, individually or as a race. He fails to reckon with the power of the other instincts. He either ignores them or resolves them into expressions of the sexual instinct. The failure has cost him many ardent followers, for many who were willing to acknowledge the value of the general structure of his psychological system

[26] Freud, *Introductory Lectures*, p. 362, also pp. 361-363.

have objected that it has been built on foundational premises which are far too narrow, and have felt that unless the foundation is broadened and strengthened, the superstructure must some day fall. They have set up new and broader bases and are building new systems which in general follow the pattern of their leader.

C. J. Jung. Perhaps the greatest among Freud's disciples who has cut loose from his master and has constructed his own organized theory of the nature of the mind of man, is C. J. Jung, of Zurich. The main cause of the rupture was Freud's "pan-sexualism," but now this is only one of the many points at which their respective systems diverge. Jung's concept of the nature of the unconscious is radically different. He believes the unconscious to be the storehouse not only of repressed wishes and forbidden desires, but of all memories, all instincts, and all inherited or acquired capacities, together with the psychic energy which gives them expression. He divides the content of the unconscious into the personal unconscious, or that which has had its birth in the life of the individual, and the collective unconscious, that which is part of the heritage of the race, "That remnant of ancient humanity and that centuries old past in all people, namely, the common property left behind from all

development, which is given to all men like the sunshine and the air."[27]

He also believes that all men can be placed in either of the two great classes which he denominates introverts and extroverts. The introvert is the man who finds satisfaction for his desires within himself, and the extrovert is the one who finds inward peace only through stimulation from without. Within these two classes he subdivides men according to what is basic in their psychical functioning, whether thinking, feeling, sensation, or intuition. Knowing the bias of these various types, and with a thorough belief in the content and power of the collective unconscious, Jung thinks he is able to explain the origin and significance of all art and literature, all science, philosophy and religion as projections of unconscious beliefs, ideals and desires, having their origin in the dim past of man's history and the power for their expression in man's unconscious wishes.

Jung's theory of the origin of psychic evil is that it is not always, nor in fact often, due to repression, but is, rather, the result of improper adaptation to changing environment. For example, the boy who, passing through the period

[27] Jung, *Psychology of the Unconscious*, p. 111. Reprinted by permission of Dodd, Mead & Company, publishers, New York.

of adolescence, fails to acquire independence of thought and action, and does not develop new ideals and standards, may very easily generate a mother complex. And he who, at a later stage, fails to make an adjustment between the effervescent ideals of earlier years and the hard facts of life, may become the subject of a phantasy. This failure at adaptation causes a regression in mental life, and the libido[28] or psychic energy which ought to be finding expression in normal action is forced into the unconscious, from where it expends itself in compensative activity, which is always, in however slight degree, abnormal.

Jung's therapy is to use Freud's method of exploration in the unconscious and to bring into the patient's conscious mind those elements regressed which are the cause of the neurosis. But he goes further and by appealing to the patient's religious or social sentiments and ideals, he seeks to inspire and encourage him to use his libido for higher ends until he reaches full adaptation to the realities within himself and in his environment.

The first natural objection to raise regarding Jung's psychology is concerning his theory of a

[28] I use "libido" in Jung's sense of the psychic energy attached to all instincts and unconscious impulses, as differing from Freud's limitation to sexual instinct energy.

collective unconscious. The majority of present-day biologists reject Lamarck's theory and deny the possibility of the inheritance of acquired characteristics. If they are right in the realm of biology, then Jung is wrong psychologically. But neo-Lamarckism is not yet done away and there is much reason for believing that evolution has come more through development than by means of natural selection. Any objection to Jung's theory of a collective unconscious on this basis cannot be sustained. It may be that some day we shall be able to prove that he is right.

There is, however, a very real and justifiable objection against Jung's theory that all art, science, and religion are the result of projections out of the unconscious. If this theory is true, then we can never know reality, for what we think we know will be only the evidence in our consciousness of our unconscious desires. It may be true in part that we rationalize our religion and develop our philosophy to suit our own needs, believing what we hope is true. But if Jung's theory can be definitely proven, then all art, science, and religion will disappear from our midst and civilization will perish, for once we are convinced that all is projection, there will be no incentive to study and no appreciation of what has been considered to be

the result of careful thinking and productive effort. If it is true, then all that we have called progress has come through a great hallucination, and man has believed a tremendous hoax at the hands of Nature. If man accepts it as true, that progress will cease and we shall revert to animalism. But it is not true. If we follow the line of reasoning by which the theory is supported, we come to a *reductio ad absurdum*. If all is projection, the theory itself is an expression of Jung's own unconscious wishes, and for that reason cannot be accepted as valid knowledge.

Alfred Adler. Alfred Adler is another of Freud's ardent followers who was forced to leave the camp of his leader because of Freud's overemphasis upon the sex motive. He too has taken great strides away from his master. He asserts that the element in man which is responsible for the heights to which he has climbed æsthetically and the depths to which he has sunk in vice, is neither the impulse of the sex libido nor the guiding power of the collective unconscious, but is an innate "quest for power" common to all. This desire to dominate is proposed as man's basic motive.

Adler states that every individual has an aim or life plan. He says, "We cannot think, feel, will, or act without the perception of some

goal,"[29] and "Every psychic phenomenon . . . can only be grasped . . . if regarded as a preparation for some goal."[30] He seeks to show that in every case that aim can be proven to be the goal of superiority. This "will to power" is what is behind the success of the world's great men. It is also what makes the world's worst criminals. It can give the explanation for all of man's plans and purposes, and also for the behavior adopted to secure their fulfillment. The normal person is the one who is able, in a large degree, to satisfy his quest for power, although no one ever attains to complete satisfaction. The abnormal person is the one who has an unnatural sense of inferiority due to some organic or nervous disadvantage.

When there is a sense of inferiority due to a physical defect or to domination by parents, family, or group, there are several avenues of escape. With many the handicap itself has been a spur to effort and has been, to some extent, responsible for victory. Stammering Demosthenes became Athens' supreme orator. "The little corporal" became the great Emperor

---

[29] Adler, *Individual Psychology*, p. 3. Reprinted by permission of Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc., publishers, New York.

[30] Adler, *Ibid.*, p. 4.

Napoleon. The puny child Roosevelt became the apostle of the strenuous life. Or the weakness may be used to acquire the sense of power, and some people "So misuse their frailties that they compel others to become subordinate to them."[31] Still others in order to compensate for their feeling of inferiority develop a phantasy that may possibly be the cause of a serious neurosis. "Every neurosis," according to Adler, "can be understood as an attempt to free oneself from a feeling of inferiority in order to gain a feeling of superiority."[32] Usually, it is through symptoms brought into activity by the unconscious to serve as compensatory excuses for one's lack of superiority, for example, anxiety, hysteria, forgetfulness, sleeplessness, perversions, hallucinations, etc.

Adler's therapy is the same in general method as Freud's and Jung's. He draws out by free-association, dream interpretation, and a study of compulsory acts, the emotional history of his patient and leads him to see the inferiority complex that is behind his symptoms. A process of reorientation completes the cure. Adler does not seek to do away with the patient's quest for power, for he believes that it is a normal thing. What he does is to help him to a

[31] Adler, *Ibid.*, p. 14.

[32] Adler, *Ibid*, p. 23.

common-sense recognition of reality; to admit his defects and to see his possibilities; and to reorganize his life in the light of this new understanding, thus gaining satisfaction for himself and taking his rightful place in his environment.

The great fault with this system is one it has in common with both Freud's and Jung's. It has a very limited horizon and all that comes into view is seen through the colored spectacles of presupposition. If Freud sees the explanation of behavior in sex, and if Jung sees primordial images in all mental associations, Adler sees the search after godlike power in every success or failure in life. In each case unjustifiable conclusions are the result of limitation in premises. Each sees what he wants to see in every patient, and, worse than that, he leads his patient to see the same thing.

W. H. R. Rivers, Morton Prince, and William McDougall. A more reasonable psychology has been developed under W. H. R. Rivers in England, and Morton Prince and William McDougall in the United States, and accepted by a great many leading psychologists in both countries.[33] "It is only a psychology fundamentally of the same type as Freud's, that is to

[33] See McDougall, *Outline of Abnormal Psychology*, Note 1, p. 24.

say, one that recognizes human nature as founded upon instinctive tendencies, and as everywhere and always manifesting purposive strivings, rooted in the instincts—it is only such a hormic psychology that can assimilate the new insight which the genius of Professor Freud has brought us."[34] It is an eclectic meta-psychology built upon the foundations of Janet and Freud, but using in its construction the contributions of Jung, Adler, and Steker, as well as the social theories of Trotter and McDougall. It recognizes the power of the conscious mind to use the psychic energy accompanying instinctive strivings and to direct the expenditure of that energy toward the realization of the ego ideal or life purpose. It is here that the future of psychology rests. Here is no fanaticism, no suiting of new developments to old theories, no bigotry, no limitation. Here is broad-minded acceptance of all new real discovery and here is progress.

Since the death of Rivers, McDougall has been recognized as the leader of this school and has presented his views as the views of the group with which he allies himself in his book, *An Outline of Abnormal Psychology*.[35] Since McDougall is a physician as well as a professor

[34] McDougall, *Outline of Abnormal Psychology*, p. 24.

[35] London, 1926.

and writer in the field of academic psychology, and the author of two books on social psychology; since he has had his dreams analyzed by Jung, and has been a student for a number of years of Janet, Freud, and Adler, he is well qualified to mark the trend of the new psychology, and to gather wheat into his garner from the several fields. He seeks to point out that which is true in the theories of the different schools and to harmonize these truths with the main body of psychological knowledge. In view of the breach that has existed between academic psychology and the different systems of psychotherapy, he says, "I have held before me, as a principal object to be attained, the bringing together in one consistent scheme what seems to be soundest and most fruitful in contemporary academic psychology and in the teaching of the various schools of abnormal psychology."[36]

This group acts on the theory of the unity of the personality, the conscious and the unconscious both having their place and work in the life of the whole individual. Mental health is maintained when there is equilibrium between the two and integration in the forces under their control. Doctor Rivers says, "According to

[36] McDougall, *Outline of Abnormal Psychology*, Preface, p. viii.

this theory mental health depends on the presence of a state of equilibrium between instinctive tendencies and the forces by which they are controlled."[37] And McDougall, ". . . . the personality which clearly and decisively wills or wishes this or that, which chooses and decides and exercises over the whole organism the mastery that we call self-control and resolve, such personality is an integration, a product of a long integrating process, the most important aspect of development and the chief aim of true education; an integration that results in a firmly knit character, from which alone true volition and intelligent consistent self-direction can proceed. In the neurotic patient this integration is very imperfect. Commonly, no doubt, the integration has never attained in such persons a high level; and such lack of integration is the defect that predisposes to neurotic disorder. . . . Yet in none of us is the integration perfect and complete: and, under sufficiently great and prolonged strain, the best of us . . . may undergo some degree of disintegration and develop neurotic troubles."[38]

In this last quotation Doctor McDougall gives his conception of the nature of perfect

[37] Rivers, *Instinct and the Unconscious*, p. 119. (2d Edition, London, 1924.)

[38] McDougall, *Outline of Abnormal Psychology*, p. 54.

personality, his theory of the cause of the neuroses, and his method of cure. Integrated personality comes with the direction of the whole life by the consciousness to conform to the ego ideal. Psychic difficulty results when the consciousness fails to accomplish this guidance and the unconscious is given more or less free rein. Cure is effected through reintegration by the readjustment of the unconscious forces, under the direction of the consciousness, toward the fulfillment of the life purpose. Thus, Freud's therapy of "making the unconscious conscious" is only a step in the process toward complete cure. Integrated personality is achieved only when the consciousness directs the whole life in accordance with the life purpose or the ego ideal.

D. Basic Similarities

It will be seen that what separate the various schools of the new psychology are the differing conclusions drawn regarding the fundamental nature of man's psyche and the primary motives that direct his life. But these differing conclusions are, in fact, differing premises. Each premise is accepted by the school that champions it as a self-evident truth, and then, supported by the weight of experimental evidence gathered under the guidance of that premise,

announced as a proven conclusion. All of which makes these differences merely differences in opinion.

The definitely proved discoveries growing out of the new psychology are common to all. All of the schools agree regarding the existence of the unconscious, the general content of the unconscious, the psychic power of the unconscious, the existence of an ego ideal in the conscious mind, the conflict between the unconscious and the ego ideal, and the power of the consciousness to direct the libido of the unconscious to attain the ego ideal.

The process of therapy is also the same for all. Each school has a name peculiar to itself, descriptive of its theory and practice, but in all cases the method is the same. Janet calls his process "Psychological Analysis"; Freud calls his "Psychoanalysis"; Jung, "Analytical Psychology"; Adler, "Individual Psychology"; and McDougall, "Integral Psychology." But, "In all psychotherapy there are two essential steps: first the process of exploration by which the nature and origin of the morbid state are as far as possible brought to light and made clear to the patient; secondly, the process of readjustment of the patient's mental life, more especially of his affective tendencies."[39] That

[39] McDougall, *Outline of Abnormal Psychology*, p. 464.

is, there is first the analysis of the psychic life of the patient, the patient's appreciation of the nature of that life, and his readjustment to reality within himself and in his environment.

CHAPTER III

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF SIN

(The Definition of Sin)

A. An Ideal Is Psychologically Essential to Human Progress

The existence of the ego ideal is the cause of psychic evil. It is the ego ideal which induces the conflict between the impulses arising out of the unconscious and the will of the conscious mind. Mental peace can be secured only when this conflict is done away, or, again using Freud's words as quoted on page 48, ". . . when they (the unconscious impulse and the conscious will) confront each other on the same ground;" that is, when the ego ideal is compatible with the unconscious impulse or the unconscious impulse is directed in its expression to satisfy the demands of the ego ideal. It is only thus that harmony within the individual can be maintained.

In order to secure this harmony and in order that full self-realization may be attained, many psychoanalysts recommend the creation of new ideals by each individual to suit his own psychic constitution. While this might in some lead

to the highest standards of ethics and religion, in others it would certainly result in gross degradation. This, however, does not materially concern the analyst, whose sole purpose is to secure harmony within the individual. For that reason, Freud says, "We can demonstrate with ease that what the world calls its code of morals demands more sacrifices than it is worth,"[1] and adds that "anyone who has successfully undergone the training of learning and recognizing the truth about himself is henceforth strengthened against the dangers of immorality, even if his standard of morality should in some respect deviate from the common one."[2] What Freud is recommending is his conception of the easiest and surest way to obtain mental equipoise. What he is suggesting is the perfect adjustment of one's native psychic equipment so that there will be no overbalancing weight of urge on the side of either one's unconscious impulses or one's ego ideal, even if to secure that adjustment one must abandon the aspiration toward the highest ideals the achievement of which calls for the most strenuous effort, and, in their place, adopt lower standards easier of attainment. If such a recommendation were

[1] Freud, *Introductory Lectures*, p. 362.

[2] Freud, *Ibid.*, p. 363. Freud, of course, by "dangers of immorality," means only the psychic dangers.

accepted there might ensue peace, but there would be no progress. Man cannot advance by lowering his ego ideal to the standard of his unconscious impulses; that way lies stagnation or degeneracy. His ego ideal must be higher than his natural impulses and his natural impulses must be expressed according to his ego ideal. This way alone leads to development. It is only because science seeks to know the perfect and final truth that it is impelled to go on. Only because art has for its ideal the conception of perfect beauty does it advance. The maintenance of absolute balance between the ego ideal and the unconscious impulses would result in stagnation for the individual and for the race.

But even worse than that, it would ultimately bring extinction. There are two methods by which an organism may do away with itself biologically. One way is not to adapt itself to its environment—and biological history is full of examples of extinction brought about thus. The other way is to adapt itself too completely to its environment—and the story of the rocks tells us of the overadaptation, and the disappearance, of the Diplodocus and other dinosaurs of the Mesozoic era. The survival of species and advancing evolution have resulted from progressive adaptation to changing en-

vironment, and in the case of man, from progressive adaptation to an environment changed in some degree by himself in accordance with an end ideal or ultimate goal which he conceived for humanity. The same is true psychologically. Man has developed only as he has adapted himself to a changing environment toward an ideal believed by him to be his only worthy goal. Freud recognizes the evil of failure at adaptation, but he does not recognize that over-adaptation would bring equally harmful consequences.

Other psychologists, however, acknowledge the importance of the ideal in man's development. Tansley says: "*The faculty of idealism*, the ability of the mind to form ideals, is one of its most valuable powers. It may indeed be considered the highest faculty of the mind, without which human progress would be impossible. The formation of an ideal is the creation of an end toward which an extended conation can be directed, and in the service of which the instincts and powers may be harnessed."[3] Further on he adds, "Psychologically the formation of an ideal always involves a passing beyond the primitive ends of the instincts, *the creation of secondary ends and values*, . . . and the formation of these secondary

[3] Tansley, *The New Psychology*, p. 161.

ends, representing as they do all the higher mental, æsthetic, ethical, and spiritual values, is an indispensable condition of the higher development of the mind and personality and of what is called human progress."[4] We have also the observation of Rivers: "We have, I think, reason to believe that the person who has attained perfection of balance in the control of his instinctive tendencies, in whom the processes of suppression and sublimation have become wholly effective, may thereby become completely adapted to his environment and attain a highly peaceful condition and stable existence. Such existence is not, however, the condition of exceptional accomplishment, for which there would seem to be necessary a certain degree of instability," growing out of "the conflict between instinctive tendencies and the forces by which they are controlled."[5] McDougall proposes a like theory: "The same development [of character] may be stated in terms of goals and purposes, the goals toward which the sentiments or their impulses are directed, the purposes that spring from them. From this point of view, we may say that the integration of personality, the development of character, results from the formation of some dominant

[4] Tansley, *Ibid*, p. 162.

[5] Rivers, *Instinct and the Unconscious*, p. 158.

purpose, the adoption of some goal that is felt to be of supreme value, a purpose and a goal to which all others are subordinated as of less urgency and lower value."[6]

And a greater than these has said, "Whosoever will save his life shall lose it; but whosoever will lose his life for my sake, the same shall save it."[7] The man who seeks only self-satisfaction or self-realization in his life must fail, but he who has a high ideal and lets that ideal mold his life is indeed happy. When the ideal is the highest possible ideal, that man must ultimately gain full self-realization, for, according to Dr. C. E. Cory, "In psychological terms, what is called a self is always an ideal rather than an accomplished fact;"[8] that is, our real self is what we hope to be, and our hopes fashion us into their likeness. If our ideal is Christ, we become Christlike. If we lose ourselves in him, we find new life. When we reflect him as a mirror, we "are transformed into the same image."[9] It is no mere dictum of the theologians that we are born anew in Christ; it is a fact of psychology. Our ideals make us what

[6] McDougall, *Outline of Abnormal Psychology*, p. 526.

[7] Luke 9. 24.

[8] Cory, "The Problems of the Individual," "Journal of Abnormal Psychology," 1922, quoted by McDougall, *Outline of Abnormal Psychology*, p. 529.

[9] 2 Cor. 3. 18.

we are, and when he is our ideal, we become like him.

Fortunately, not only is ethical idealism necessary for progress, despite the evil that may arise out of the conflict it engenders, but it is also a part of man's psychic constitution. It is consequently impossible for man to bring civilization to a stalemate. Even most primitive man has a system of laws governing his activities that has grown out of idealistic life standards, a fact which Freud himself has recognized in his book, *Totem and Taboo.* He also has been forced by his study to abandon his purely hedonistic psychology and to admit that the pleasure-principle is often "replaced by the reality principle, which without giving up the intention of ultimately attaining pleasure yet demands and enforces the postponement of satisfaction,"[10] which is a frank admission of the existence of an ideal that is higher than our natural impulses and which directs the manner of their expression.

Ethical idealism, then, is a part of man's psychological endowment, and an ego ideal is essential to his progress.

The Ego Ideal Is Fashioned After an Objective Standard. While man is born with what Tansley calls "the faculty of idealism," or "the

[10] Freud, *Beyond the Pleasure Principle,* p. 5.

ability of the mind to form ideals,"[11] the ego ideal which is set up by that power results from the individual's reaction to objective standards. We are not equipped with an ego ideal or life purpose at birth, but that ideal is produced and developed through the reactions of our conscious mental life to external stimuli, whether through the customs and taboos fostered by our own social group, or through the influence of one or more outstanding personalities.

This theory has been practically demonstrated in the lives of two little girls found living in a cave with wolves in India. It is believed that they had been abandoned in infancy by parents who did not want girl babies, and, like Romulus and Remus, were cared for by the wolves. When discovered they were living with animals and like animals. They ran on all fours; they uttered peculiar barking cries; they feared man and would dart away at his approach with the same ability and agility as the beasts of the field; when eating they put their mouths to the food instead of raising the food to their mouths with their hands, as they might have done if they had been nurtured by monkeys. When taken into a missionary's home, one soon died, and only

[11] Tansley, *The New Psychology*, p. 161.

with great difficulty and infinite patience has the other been taught to sit on a chair, to walk uprightly, to eat at table by using her hands, and to speak a few English words. The adaptation to the new environment required too great a change for the one, and it was almost too much for the other. They had become habituated to the only manner of living which they had ever known. The story provides some evidence of the importance of our environment in determining the nature of our development.

All the psychoanalysts recognize the powerful effect wrought by external stimuli on the developing psyche of any individual. Freud scrutinizes carefully all the data that he can draw forth from a patient by means of analysis, in an effort to locate the particular external stimulus or stimuli which caused the repression that is behind his patient's neurosis. Adler just as diligently searches for the outside cause of his patient's inner sense of inferiority, and looks for domineering parents, a clever brother or sister, or taunting schoolmates. Even Jung, who maintains that all external ideals are but the projection of our own unconscious wishes onto other personalities, holds that the failure to recognize external reality is a primary cause of psychic evil. And they all agree that the

most difficult patient to treat is the one who is narcissistic, who has turned his libido upon himself and finds satisfaction for all of his desires within himself. When the psychotherapist seeks to draw him out, an interference is erected that psychoanalysis cannot surmount.

This theory of the origin of the ego ideal out of external stimuli is developed by McDougall in the chapter on "The Advance to the Higher Plane of Social Conduct," Chapter VIII, in his *Social Psychology*. He shows "that the sentiments determine our moral judgments."[12] If they be the emotional sentiments, judgment will be perverted, but if they are the abstract sentiments of "love of justice, truth, courage, self-sacrifice, hatred of selfishness, of deception, of slothfulness,"[13] moral judgment will be valid. But these "special moral sentiments must be brought into connection with, and organized within, the system of a more comprehensive sentiment—what may be called the master sentiment among all the moral sentiments, namely, the sentiment for a perfected or completely moral life."[14] Later on he demonstrates

---

[12] McDougall, *Social Psychology* (Revised Edition, Boston, 1926), p. 224. Reprinted by permission of John W. Luce & Company, publishers, Boston.

[13] McDougall, *Ibid.*, p. 224.

[14] McDougall, *Ibid.*, p. 232.

that the abstract sentiments "are not independently formed judgments, but rather emotional judgments under the very powerful directing influence of personal suggestion and sympathy,"[15] generally during childhood. And with most of us, "A fine character, or life finely lived, has these æsthetic properties, and therefore our admiration of it will be an æsthetic admiration, in so far as we appreciate its harmony and unity; we are then disposed to desire all the more strongly that our own character shall be of this nature."[16] Thus the ego ideal is formed.

It will therefore be recognized that it is the way we react to external stimuli that affects our psychic lives for either good or evil, and our ego ideal results from the way we react to external standards. For, while our inborn characteristics may influence the manner of our reaction, it is still true that the manner of our reaction determines the nature of our developed psyche.

The ego ideal, then, is generated by the character of our response to an objective standard. Thus, in a very real way, we do not make our ideal, we find it.

The External Standard Must be Christ. If it is

[15] McDougall, *Ibid.*, p. 229.
[16] McDougall, *Ibid.*, p. 233.

true, as pointed out in the first part of this chapter, that man's ego ideal or life purpose must be higher than can be accomplished with ease in order to save him from stagnation or possible extinction, it becomes at once evident that the only ultimate ideal that is suitable for his nature must be the ideal of absolute perfection. Anything less than that must go the way of all the lesser ideals that have been cast aside along the march of civilization. Man's ultimate ego ideal must be the achievement of absolute perfection. He is satisfied with nothing less, and nothing less will satisfy the requirements of his progress.

The new psychologists assume this. They study that which has handicapped man in his advance, and they seek means to free him of his burdens that he may move on unhampered, with greater speed, toward his goal. They point out that the goal is completely integrated personality or full self-realization—a goal which none of us has attained, yet which is nevertheless theoretically possible of attainment. The only completely integrated personality is the perfect personality. Where there is less than perfection there is incomplete integration, and if one should attain complete integration, he would have achieved perfection.

Christ is the only person who, as a human,

has been perfect, and whose personality was completely integrated with consummate love at its center as the dominating sentiment. No one has ever convicted him of sin. No one has ever proved him to have been wrong either in his ideals or his life, his teaching or his practice. The world is coming to realize more and more his thorough rightness. Even those who refuse to accept the doctrines of his followers acknowledge the perfection of their Master. No one else has been given the same acknowledgment. No one else has claimed perfection for himself and had his claim accepted by a skeptical world.

Therefore, if an ego ideal of ultimate perfection is essential to man's ethical development; if the ideal must be generated by an objective standard; and if Christ is the only perfect objective standard, the ego ideal must be fashioned after the pattern of Christ.

There will, of course, be raised the objection that perfection, even the perfection of Christ, is a fixed standard and must therefore, if my former argument is true, be discarded with the rest, for its realization in life must also result in stagnancy. It is a fixed standard, to be sure, but our knowledge of it is a developing knowledge. Absolute perfection must be our ultimate goal, but as yet we do not know with any degree of accuracy what absolute perfection is.

We are far from knowing what it is abstractly, and we are also far from knowing it in Christ. As we move toward an understanding of it, it moves on, ever in advance of our absolute apprehension. Browning expresses the same thought in the first stanza of "Easter Day,"

"We do not see it as it is,
At the beginning of the race:
As we proceed it shifts its place,
And where we looked for crowns to fall,
We find the tug's to come—that's all."

When man arrives at the place of what he had thought was perfection, he finds from this higher eminence that there are still loftier goals for which to strive, nobler ideals to be realized, higher standards to be achieved.

Our cognition of perfection is progressive, but our appreciation of it comes only with moving in its direction. Saint Paul, at the beginning of his ministry, boldly asks the question: "Am I not an apostle? . . . Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?"[17] But the more he saw of Jesus, and the more he knew of the perfection of Christ, the more he realized his own failure to attain that perfection, and at the end of his life called himself the chief of sinners.[18]

The standard of absolute perfection is Christ,

[17] 1 Cor. 9. 1.

[18] 1 Tim. 1. 15.

and in order to know that standard we must move toward it.

B. Deviation From the Standard Is Sin

Sin is any deviation from this standard of perfection as revealed by and in Jesus Christ. It is not merely the violation of moral law, nor the divergence from the ego ideal, but the conscious or unconscious deviation from the standard of perfection in Christ. This deviation does not always imply culpability, but it always brings evil in its train, for it widens the breach between God and man.

It will be necessary to consider each of these statements separately in order to determine their validity.

Sin Is Not Merely Violation of the Moral Law. Deviation from the moral law does not offer a definition of sin, for moral law is a code growing out of the practical needs of communal or group life, and is different at different times and in different places. Deviation from the moral law is wrong action in relation to one's group, but sin is wrong action in relation to God. Wrong action may be criminal to society, harmful to one's neighbor, or evil to oneself, but it is always sin against God. As Martineau puts it, "Human society may punish us for *crimes,* human monitors reprove us for *vices;* but

God alone can charge upon us the *sin*, which he alone is able to forgive."[19]

The psychologists recognize that something higher than the moral code of society is essential to man's attainment of his highest end ideals or purposes. Tansley says: "But we must, nevertheless, reject altogether the ultimate authority of the moral code to govern the individual life. The ultimate authority must be sought within the individual's own mind. In inquiring as to the nature of this authority we find that we must have a standard to replace the herd standard, an ideal to which we strive to conform, and this can only be represented by what has been called 'the higher moral self.' For convenience we shall speak of it as the ethical self."[20] And McDougall asserts that the highest stage of ethical development is not "the stage in which conduct is controlled in the main by the anticipation of social praise and blame," but the "stage in which conduct is regulated by an ideal of conduct that enables a man to act in the way that seems to him right regardless of the praise or blame of his immediate social environment."[21]

[19] Martineau, *Types of Ethical Theory*. Quoted by Tennant, *The Concept of Sin*, p. 22. Reprinted by permission of The Macmillan Company, publishers, New York.

[20] Tansley, *The New Psychology*, p. 195.

[21] McDougall, *Social Psychology*, p. 186.

It is the Christian concept of the destiny of man which forces us to accept this definition of sin as any deviation from the standard as revealed in Christ. If man's destiny were only to take his place as an unimpeding or unhampering member of society, a smooth cog in the wheel of progress, the moral law or ethical code would be the natural regulator of his conduct. But if man was made to have fellowship with God, then the only possible standard is the standard of perfection, and he must become like God. The thing that will make man a sinner or a saint is not the measure with which he meets the moral requirements of his group, but the success he has in becoming godlike. Sin is not merely the antithesis of ethical idealism, it is the opposite of holiness.

Sin Is Not Only Divergence From the Ego Ideal. The psychologists maintain that man has risen to his highest morally when his behavior is controlled by his ethical self, whether the standards of that ethical self are higher, lower, or equal with the accepted standards of society.[22] Many popular teachers and writers also proclaim the doctrine that the conscience can be man's only guide, and he is a sinner only as he departs from the dictates of his own conscience.

[22] See McDougall, *Social Psychology*, p. 186; Tansley, *op. cit.*, p. 161; Freud, *Introductory Lectures*, p. 363.

Even Tennant, perhaps the foremost English writer on the subject of sin, says, "Not the highest ideal there is to be known, but the highest that a given individual at a given time can know, must be the standard by which at that time, that individual's acts and character are to be judged as sinful or sinless."[23]

This definition of the gauge that measures the ethical man does not satisfy Kant's criterion that the truly moral man is the one who acts so that the principle of his action might be universal law.[24] Even if a man lived absolutely according to the highest ideal he might know at any given time, and that ideal were not Christ, the principle guiding his life could not be universal law, for it would apply only to them that had the same standards.

This gauge is also unsuitable for the Christian, who seeks to follow his Lord's command and be perfect, as his heavenly Father is perfect.[25] Again, it is a matter of our belief in man's destiny. If man is to have fellowship with God, he must be able to know God. Before he can know God, his own personality must be thoroughly integrated, otherwise his knowledge

---

[23] Tennant, *Concept of Sin*, p. 87. Reprinted by permission of The Macmillan Company, publishers, New York.

[24] Kant, *Practical Reason*, p. 139.

[25] See Matt. 5. 48.

of reality cannot be absolute and right. As McDougall points out in Chapter VIII of his *Social Psychology*, only when the moral sentiments are "organized within . . . the sentiment for a perfected or completely moral life"[26] are the abstract judgments of justice, truth, courage, etc., valid; that is, only when life is integrated on the plane of perfection are absolute truths completely knowable. Now, to be thoroughly integrated a man must have accomplished perfect balance between his ego and his ego ideal; that is, he must have raised his ego to his ego ideal. This cannot be accomplished until his life conforms to his ego ideal at its highest, which can come only when his is an ideal for perfect Christlikeness.[27] So, while deviation from the ego ideal is sin, it is sin because it is deviation from the ultimate standard. Man's conformity to his ego ideal at any earlier stage in his progress toward perfection would not make it possible for him to have fellowship with God. Conformity must be to the external standard of perfect integration of character, Jesus Christ. "Neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him."[28]

[26] P. 224.

[27] For supporting argument, see pp. 63-67, 74-76.

[28] Matt. 11. 27.

Not until we are like Christ can we have fellowship with God.

Sin Is Witting or Unwitting Deviation From the Standard of Christ. The definition of sin in the *Westminster Shorter Catechism* is, "The transgression of or lack of conformity to the law of God." Now, if the law of God is understood to mean the law of life as revealed in Christ, then sin is any deviation from the standard of Christ, whether it be the result of ignorance, or done in the light of knowledge, a "transgression of or lack of conformity to" the standard of Christ.

This definition is no harder in the spiritual realm than the law discovered by the psychoanalysts is hard in the psychical realm. Any repression, conscious or unconscious, will keep one from full self-realization, and may result in a serious neurosis. A repression doesn't have to be conscious to cause psychic evil. An individual may repress the memory of an unpleasant experience in complete unconsciousness, and his entire life may be spent under the domination of a neurosis for which he has in no way been consciously responsible.

An analogy may help to explain my position. The standard of time generally accepted over the earth is set by the observatory at Greenwich. Local time is determined by the longitudinal position east or west of the prime

meridian, but sun time at Greenwich is basic the world around. A man's watch may operate with all precision and accuracy, but if it is not set according to the standard, it will be wrong. He may choose to set it wrong himself for certain ends he may desire. The farmers in Aberdeenshire set their clocks and watches three quarters of an hour fast in order to advance their noonday meal. They are content with their own ideal, but it is wrong. Or a man may set his watch to the best of his knowledge, but his knowledge may not be accurate. His watch also is wrong. Even for those places where Greenwich time is not known, their timekeeping is wrong according to the standard. So a man may choose to set his life according to a standard that is lower than that which he knows is best, in order to gain certain ends he may desire. His life is wrong. Or a man may set his life according to his best knowledge of the standard and still be wrong. Or he may not know the universal standard at all. Still, his life is wrong. It is not only "transgression of," it is also "lack of conformity to."

This is Paul's definition of sin. He includes much more than the actual overt sin for which the individual is personally responsible. He includes all the evil in the race that separates man from God. "When he wishes to bring

in the further idea of personal responsibility, he calls it transgression, or trespass, or disobedience."[29] With Paul, "all cases of transgression are cases of sin, but all cases of sin are not cases of transgression."[30]

It is also Christ's definition. He too showed that sin might be unwitting, or done in ignorance. After the Roman soldiers had crucified him, his first word from the cross, according to Luke, was, "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do."[31] If sin is only wrong thinking or acting for which a person is at the time consciously responsible, then the prayer of Jesus is beside the point. Christ himself said that they didn't know the nature of what they had done, and yet he asked God to forgive them. If they had not sinned, they had no need for forgiveness. But if theirs was sin, true sin, though ignorant sin, then Christ could pray for their forgiveness.

Sin, then, is any deviation from the standard of Christ. Of course there will be raised the objection that if Christ as we know him in his manhood is the standard, then in his childhood and youth he too must have been a sinner, for in these early years he himself did not realize

[29] Bicknell, *The Christian Idea of Sin and Original Sin*, p. 23.
[30] See Rom., Chap. 5.
[31] Luke 23. 34.

his ultimate ideal, for, as it is written, he "increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man."[32] It is only necessary to state that the standard is his perfectly integrated personality with love at its core, perfectly integrated for every stage of his development, a standard that is possible of ultimate realization by all.

Culpability. Perhaps the most commonly accepted definition of sin is that it is only that which is reprehensible and worthy of punishment, that for which a person is actually blameworthy, having chosen a lesser ideal to guide his life in the presence of a possible higher choice, or, having consciously acted in a manner contrary to his own highest sense of what is right and what is wrong. Tennant embodies this conception of sin in his definition, "Sin may be defined as moral imperfection for which an agent is, in God's sight, accountable."[33]

Certainly, culpability does enter into any consideration of sin, and Christ says, "For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required."[34] And at the conclusion of the parable of the faithful and unfaithful servants

---

[32] Luke 2. 52.

[33] Tennant, *The Concept of Sin*, p. 245. Reprinted by permission of The Macmillan Company, publishers, New York.

[34] Luke 12. 48.

which immediately precedes this statement, he says, "That servant, which knew his lord's will, and made not ready, nor did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes,"[35] *but* he adds, "He that knew not, and did things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes."[36] Although he is to be beaten with fewer stripes there is punishment even for him who did not know his lord's will. We have carried this same principle into our civil law, and ignorance of the law does not excuse from punishment anyone who breaks the law.

The difference is a difference between guilt and sin. Wrong action for which a person is guilty is always sin, but there is such a thing as sin for which a person is not guilty. There is much in our lives that is wrong through no conscious fault of ours, yet which separates us from God. A man may be guilty of sin and need forgiveness; a man also may be sinful, though we nor God would condemn him, and yet he would be in need of salvation. Two men may commit the same kind of sin, and one be worthy of condemnation, while the other may be entirely blameless, yet each suffers the result of his sin on his character, and each has this handicap to overcome in his progress toward

[35] Luke 12. 47.
[36] Luke 12. 48.

perfection. In the realm of psychology the cause of a neurosis may not be a man's own choice of repression to rid himself of unpleasant memories or unwanted impulses; it may not be due to his conscious refusal to lift his ego to his ego ideal, but yet the neurosis is real and he must be relieved of it and the cause for it before he can gain integration of personality. Evil follows in the path of sin, whether guilty or blameless, and sin must be cleared away before mankind can be rid of the evil.

A standard of culpability as defining sinfulness or sinlessness is a standard advising man's conformity to life as it is. Christ's standard insists upon conformity to life as it ought to be.

CHAPTER IV

PSYCHIC EVIL AND THE ESSENCE OF SIN

(The Nature of Sin)

A. The Difference Between Psychic Evil and Sin

During recent years there has been a growing tendency to indentify sin with psychic evil, and because of this supposed identity to discountenance the Christian doctrine and to explain away sin on the basis of the various theories of the neuroses. The identification has been founded upon similarities that are apparent in the action and in the result of the neuroses and of sin. It needs to be demonstrated that the similarities are superficial and that basically there are vital differences.

It has been observed that psychic evil and sin originate in much the same way—that each grows out of a failure in adaptation to reality. This likeness has been offered as a reason for acknowledging their oneness. The observation, however, is a surface observation and a closer examination reveals that a great difference exists between the objective realities to which, in

the opinion of the psychologist and of the Christian, the soul fails to adapt itself. Psychic evil results from the failure of the human personality to relate itself adequately to its human environment. Sin results from the failure of the human personality to relate itself perfectly to God. One reality is present and passing. The other is ultimate and eternal.

It has also been pointed out that being under the domination of a neurosis and being under the power of sin are similar experiences. In neither state can the individual control his actions. The neurotic cannot do other than perform the symptomatic acts which are the evidence of his neurosis. The man under the power of sin cannot choose other than to sin. It is maintained that both are equally unaccountable. Here, again, the likeness is superficial. The neurotic and the sinner may perform the same kind of act and each may find it impossible to restrain himself. The casual observer might think they have been actuated by the same motives and that they desire the same ends. There was a time when, if their acts were contrary to the accepted standards, both were considered guilty of sin in the same degree. We now know that the nature of the power that impels the one is vastly different from the nature of the power that impels the

other. They are not actuated by the same motives. The neurotic is sick and the sinner is wicked. The psychic energy of the neurotic, because it has been forbidden expression in ways that are normal, forces expression of itself in ways that are abnormal. These abnormal expressions may be in acts which mankind has considered to be sinful; or they may be in acts which mankind has considered to be virtuous. In either case the expression is abnormal and the result of a mental disease. The confirmed sinner, however, has brought himself under the dominion of sin by a series of choices that have established the manner of his choosing. He has habituated himself to sin by choosing to sin. The difference is that the neurotic is not offered any choice, but acts according to the impulse of his misdirected psychic energy, while the sinner always chooses, even though his choice is invariably wrong because of his established habit. The neurotic is dominated by an uncontrolled unconscious. The sinner is guided by a twisted consciousness. The neurotic has a complex. The sinner has false ideals. The neurotic needs a physician. The sinner needs God.

In this connection it should be pointed out that it is possible for psychic evil to result from sin just as Freud has demonstrated that the

neuroses may be caused by a misguided concept of what is virtuous. Sin may cause the repression of the ethical ideal. It may generate various perversions or cause a complex and lead to functional disorders. Under these conditions, deliverance from sin may be the first step toward freedom from the neurosis. Jesus said to the man sick of the palsy, "Son, thy sins are forgiven," before he said, "Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thy house."[1] The man evidently needed forgiveness before he could be healed. His disease may have been functional with its source in his sin. The same general thing has happened many times in our own day. Many an alcoholic, for example, has, through a religious experience, gained freedom from his bondage to drink. And the new faith inspired by conversion has eliminated the fear complex for many an individual, and a new courage has been born.

Among the psychologists there is general agreement with McDougall's statement that "in none of us is the integration [of personality] perfect and complete,"[2] and that we all are, in however slight degree, unbalanced. It has been suggested that since the completely integrated personality is the only perfect per-

[1] Mark 2. 5 and 11.

[2] McDougall, *Outline of Abnormal Psychology*, p. 54.

sonality, any imperfection is caused by lack of integration, and the difference between the man who approaches perfection and the neurotic whose life is dominated by psychical evil is only a difference in degree and not in kind. In other words, if none of us is completely integrated, and if perfection comes only with complete integration, then we deviate from the standard of perfection because of our imperfect integration, and the deviation should not be reckoned as sin. It is said that since we all are in some degree short of integration we cannot know the difference between right and wrong, and since we cannot know, we cannot do what is right. This is an ingenious proposal, and seems to give a plausible explanation to the universal "transgression of and lack of conformity to" the standard of Christ, and appears to offer a new definition of original sin. If we could look at the proposition with unbiased minds, we should be inclined to accept it, but our minds are biased. We refuse to believe that our power of choice is not free. We vigorously deny that any choice we make is not of our own making. Our own sense of guilt condemns us when we have acted contrary to our ego ideal and we are pleased with ourselves when we have risen to our standards. In each case the feeling grows out of the con-

fidence that the method of acting is the result of our own free choice. Neither self-condemnation nor self-satisfaction could arise without this confidence in the freedom of the will. We reprove ourselves even for wrong actions done entirely in ignorance, thinking within ourselves, "I might have done otherwise, had I only chosen to do so." A further reason for rejecting the proposal is that the psychologists assert that integration can always be accomplished by the conscious direction of the whole life in keeping with the ego ideal. That is to say, we have the power of achieving our life purpose, if we choose to use it. By consciously molding our behavior into the fashion of our ego ideal, we can rise to the plane of our higher standards. As McDougall points out, "A firm or strong or well-knit character, one that can resist all disintegrating influences, is one that can face all problems, all critical alternatives, and give that line of action an assured predominance over all others; and this capacity depends upon the organization of the sentiments in an ordered system dominated by a master sentiment; and of all possible master sentiments the most effective is a sentiment for an ideal of character, an autonomous self, a reflective self that can control, in the light of reason and moral principles, all the promptings of other sentiments as

well as the crude urgings of instinct and appetite."[3] Perfect integration is possible to all normal persons if they organize their lives around a master sentiment or life purpose, and any failure to direct the life in harmony with the master sentiment makes the individual responsible, even when not blameworthy, for any lack of integration. The Christian says that when a life is not organized around the master sentiment of perfect love as found in Christ, the individual is responsible for his failure to realize perfection and is a sinner. He may not be blameworthy, but he is responsible, and his failure brings retribution and separation from God. We have in civil law the verdict of manslaughter for the taking of life without malice or premeditation. Even though it may not have been done for wrongful motives or with intention, it still carries punishment. The prisoner is held responsible for the killing, though not guilty of murder.

B. Concepts of the Essence of Sin

One of the problems that has most engaged the philosophers throughout the ages has been to discover wherein lies the essence of evil. It has commanded their attention because evil plays such a prominent part in the life of the

[3] McDougall, *Outline of Abnormal Psychology*, p. 538.

individual and of society. More than that, it has been recognized that if we could solve this riddle, we should be well on our way to a solution of the meaning of life itself. There have been many and varied explanations offered, most of which carry a measure of truth, but none of which has yet gained general acceptance. Socrates taught that ignorance is the root of all evil and where wisdom is, there is virtue. Plato held that lack of harmony in the individual and in society results in evil for all. Aristotle proposed that extremes beget controversy and the golden mean, "moderation in all things," is the road to happiness. Down through the years other great thinkers have put their minds to the same question and have offered their various proposals as solutions of the problem.

In our day the psychologists have looked for an answer to this age-old enigma with the aid of the new knowledge they have at their hand. Their suggestions, however, are only those of the philosophers expressed in different terminology. Freud's theory that "making the unconscious conscious" will rid the individual of psychical evil and Jung's proposal of self-knowledge and adaptation to reality sound much like Socrates' plan to sow knowledge in order to reap goodness. McDougall's integrated personality sounds very much like

Plato's harmony of soul, and the behaviorists' ideal for an organized society, like Plato's Republic. Adler's idea that psychic evil grows out of the antagonism between what we are and what we would like to be and Freud's suggestion that the neuroses are generated by the conflict between the ego ideal and the unconscious impulses sound like Aristotle's struggle of the opposites and their therapy of compromising the conflict by bringing the opposites together, like his golden mean.

Christian theologians have considered the contiguous problem of the essence of sin and have offered as many and as varied explanations. No one explanation has gained general acceptance. It becomes necessary for us to examine the several more important theories that have been proposed, and to ascertain which should be regarded as the soundest and most nearly perfected concept of the essence of sin upon which to concentrate in this study.

Sin as Imperfection. This theory, as elaborated by Hodge[4] and Müller,[5] is the contention that since all being, as being, is good, and that God, as the Supreme Being, is the supreme good, then absolute evil is nothing, and any limitation of being is sin. Spinoza, in his

[4] Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, vol. ii, pp. 133-37.

[5] Müller, *The Christian Doctrine of Sin*, vol. i, pp. 271-95.

presentation of the theory, maintains that goodness is identical with power, and hence that sin, or lack of virtue, is merely lack of power, or weakness. Baur of Tübingen implies that since freedom from sin is coincident with the removal of all limitation, then where there is limitation in any being there is sin, and since only God is without limitation, then only God is sinless and only God can be sinless. A very near approach to this theory was made by Leibnitz, whose position was that a creature could not have been made perfect. His knowledge and power of necessity had to be limited, else he would have been equal with his Creator. If limited, then he must not only have been liable to error, but error or sin was unavoidable, for perfect action could not proceed from a less than perfect agent.

This theory is of special interest to us because we find in the new psychology the suggestion that wrong thinking and wrong acting are very often the result of self-imposed limitations or the failure to realize one's power, and that the road to larger and more satisfactory life is by way of recognizing that the limitation is only delusion, and by practicing the use of the power. This concept is the premise upon which the systems of Janet and Adler have been built.

This theory is wrong, in the first place, because it makes sin a necessity to existence, for if all creatures must be finite, and all that is finite must be limited, and if all limitation is sin, then to exist must mean to be sinful. Sin thus becomes an attribute of existence. But necessary sin is an anomaly. It is impossible. The theory also proposes that with increase of power comes increased virtue. But it has always been the observation of students of human nature that the possession of great power is always accompanied with the possibility of great wickedness, and that the strongest are often the most iniquitous. Knowledge too may be a weapon of evil and increase in knowledge may bring greater sin. It is possible that the recognition of this power of knowledge for evil was the reason for the manner in which the writer of the story of the fall told of the entry of sin into the life of the race. The theory also holds out a hopeless eternity of sinfulness, for if God alone is infinite and therefore sinless and man can only approach toward that infinity, then man must always be sinful. The limitation that makes man sinful, however, is not limitation as to infinite personality, but limitation as to integrated personality. Man may always be limited as to infinity, but he need not be limited as to the

perfect co-ordination of his finite powers. If this theory were true, Christ himself must be reckoned as a sinner, for he was limited as to infinity, but he was a perfectly integrated personality even in the finiteness which he assumed in the incarnation.

Sin as Sensuousness. This theory has been held in every age, and its advocates go back to the apostle Paul to get support for their position. They maintain that Paul taught that the body itself is sinful and the cause of sin. They refer, for example, to Rom. 7. 23-24, "But I see a different law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity under the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me out of the body of this death?" Paul could not have meant, even in this quotation, that the flesh is in itself sinful, else he could not in another place have proclaimed that the body is the temple of the Holy Spirit, nor could he have urged his followers to "present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God." The most Paul could have meant was that man's carnal nature was a source of sin, even an important source, albeit not the only source. He shows that the sin which is of the flesh lies in the way one makes use of his body, when he says, "Let

not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey the lusts thereof; neither present your members unto sin as instruments of unrighteousness; but present yourselves unto God, as alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God."[6]

The theory has had a new impetus in modern times, due to the philosophy growing out of the theory of evolution. The advocates of the theory of the evolutionary development of man say that he has progressed from that which is lower to that which is higher; that his higher self is evident in the spiritual nature of his mind and that his lower self is evident in the sensuous nature of his body. His mind has constantly led him to higher goals, while his sensuous body has tended to keep him tied to lower ideals.

The discoveries made during the last few years in the field of psychology have also added strongly to the position that sin, in its essence, is sensuousness. The main discovery of the new psychology which bears on personality is that man's mind is composed of two elements, the conscious mind and the unconscious mind. The unconscious is the seat of the characteristics we have inherited from our animal ancestors, as well as the forgotten memories and repres-

[6] Rom. 6. 12 and 13.

sions resulting from our own experience. It is here that our primary instincts and animal impulses have their origin. The conscious mind is the rational element, the unfinished result of the evolutionary process in man, and the unconscious is the sensuous element, irrational and hedonistic, a constant encumbrance to evolution.

R. S. Moxon[7] and S. A. McDowall[8] are two proponents of this theory of sin as sensuousness who use the results of the researches made in the field of biological evolution and the psychological discovery of the dualistic nature of the mind to lend strength to their position. They remind us that the unconscious element is the present-day evidence of that which had completely controlled man's every activity before, in the process of evolution, he had developed into a personality. It was first in the field. They say that the conscious element, or man's powers of rationalizing himself with the universe, is the evidence of God's purpose, through evolution, to lead man from the pure state of nature to become "perfect as the Father is perfect." They define sin as "resistance to the divine process of mental evolution in man. It

[7] Moxon, *The Doctrine of Sin*, Chaps. VII and VIII. Reprinted by permission of George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., London.

[8] McDowall, *Evolution and the Need of Atonement.*

is unfaithfulness to the moral ideal—refusal to moralize the animal instincts and to use the energies latent within them for the benefit of others instead of for the gratification of selfish desires."[9]

They are careful to differentiate between what Tennant calls "the material of sin," and actual sin. The material of sin consists in the animal instincts, appetites and passions. They say that this material of sin is essential to man if he is to be a moral creature. It is conceivable that he could be a perfectly functioning being without this material of sin, but he could not be moral. As Bicknell puts it, "If we did not possess it, we could not become sinners, but we could not become saints either."[10] Morality is the result of volition in the right direction when the possibility exists of choosing to go the wrong way. Consequently, the mere possession of animal instincts, appetites, and passions is not sinful, but the satisfaction of them in situations in which that satisfaction is opposed to our moral obligations constitutes sin.

The advocates of this theory do not in any sense minimize the heinousness of sin, for they maintain that a man not only hinders his own

[9] Moxon, *The Doctrine of Sin*, p. 246.

[10] Bicknell, *The Christian Idea of Sin and Original Sin*, p. 59.

spiritual development, but that, in so far as he refuses to adhere to the divine program of evolution, he handicaps the progress of the entire race. In order to save man from this sin of submitting to his primary impulses, they recommend that these impulses be sublimated in altruistic endeavors. Our instincts should not be repressed, but should be transformed, and the excess power, above what is necessary to our own life, should be used in sublimated form for the good of others and the advancement of God's plan.

This theory, in its modern presentation, has been rid of some of the very evident objections with which it was confronted in its earlier form. For example, it could be objected to the older theory that if sin grows out of our sensuous nature, then it has its greatest power in childhood. A child learns to satisfy the sensational instincts and to act upon sensuous desires before its spirit awakens to consciousness and clear judgment of what is right and wrong. It is first of all an animal. Under the old presentation of this theory, the child must, in his earliest years, have been reckoned completely and wholly sinful, but in the new presentation the child is conceived as merely passing through a stage of necessary imperfection on the road to perfection. Also, according to

the former representation, if sin is sensuousness, then to be free from sin, one must lead an ascetic life and remove himself from anything that might affect his soul through his senses. The new representation, however, with the aid of the discoveries of the new psychology, recognizes that the abundant life comes not with repression of the instinct impulses, but with their expression toward the attainment of spiritual ends. Although this theory recognizes the conscious acceptance of the lower impulses in preference to the higher demands of the rational mind as being the center of sin, and although, in the plan of redemption which is held to follow upon this conception of sin, Christ is made the sole source of salvation, yet there are several legitimate objections that might be raised. In the first place, there is too much stress laid upon the unconscious as being the seat of sin. Even if the theory maintains that the actual sin takes place in the acceptance by the conscious mind of the unconscious, animalistic impulse, yet the natural inference is that the unconscious is the source of all sin. This is not true to fact. The most heinous sins are the ones that are localized in the conscious mind. Christ had but little condemnation for those whose sins were of the flesh, arising out of the natural instincts, and his

greatest woes were pronounced against those whose sins were the conscious sins of greed, malice, envy, and pride. Also the theory makes the moral ideal too purely subjective. The objective moral ideal, the revelation of God's perfect law of love, is to be found in the teaching and the life of Christ. The advocates of this theory hold that "Jesus came to vindicate the great principle of altruism which underlay the whole of God's world plan. But man must accept that principle and make it his own before he can be saved."[11] This is quite true, but it does not go far enough. Jesus came to vindicate God's world plan, but more than that, he came to reveal God. And the principle of God's altruistic world plan can be recognized and accepted only as exemplified in the life and character of Christ.

Sin as Selfishness. Julius Müller among the latter-day theologians was the most outstanding advocate of the theory that selfishness constitutes the essence of sin. His presentation of the theory is lucid, and in general is the argument as proclaimed by others who have held the same belief. According to Müller, evil presupposes good, being the apostasy from good, and therefore can be defined only by contrast

[11] Moxon, *The Doctrine of Sin*, p. 216, and McDowall, *Evolution and the Need of Atonement*, p. 177.

to that which is good. Christ defined good for the Pharisee in Matt. 22. 36-39 as "love to God" penetrating the whole man, and this, together with love to man, constituted all the law and the prophets. This complete love to God does not mean that the personality is dissolved in God, but means that there is perfect fellowship with God. If love to God is the central principle of good, then estrangement from God is the central principle of evil. Of course sin is a perversion of our relations to the world also, but as our true relations to the world arise out of our relations to God, the derangement of the former is necessarily involved in the derangement of the latter. But estrangement from God can develop only through too great a love for self. When man loves his neighbors, he gives evidence of his love to God, and when he loves neither God nor his neighbors, it is because he has too much regard for himself. This does not mean that self-regard is sin, for man must have regard for himself before he can love his neighbor. The second part of Christ's command implies it: "Love thy neighbor *as thyself*." One cannot love his neighbor unless he has a real regard for himself. Nor does it mean that the natural impulses of the self are to be denied. Christ entered every phase of life and lived life to the

full, yet he was always obedient to his Father. What it does mean is that where there is sin, it is because the life is built upon the single principle of satisfaction of self. "The innermost essence of sin, then, the ruling and penetrating principle in all its forms, is selfishness,"[12] says Müller.

The theory is very good as far as it goes, but, like the theory of *Sin as Sensuousness*, it doesn't go far enough. Selfishness is sin, but not all sin is selfishness. A recent confession brought to light by the Danish explorer Knud Rasmussen aptly illustrates this point. Aiding Peary in his dash for the north pole in 1909 was Professor Ross G. Marvin, of Cornell University. At 86° 38′, Marvin turned back with two Eskimos, Kudlooktoo and Harrigan. After several days of hard trekking over the ice, Marvin became angry with Harrigan for following Kudlooktoo with the sledge and provisions, rather than following him. In his anger, Marvin ordered Harrigan away without food or fuel, to suffer his fate at the hands of the elements, but Harrigan followed as the others continued on their way. Later they came to a big lead where Marvin and Kudlooktoo separated to look for a crossing. Kudlooktoo called to Harrigan to bring him a rifle

[12] Müller, *The Christian Doctrine of Sin*, vol. i, p. 134.

from the sledge, as he had sighted a seal. With the rifle he shot Marvin. Kudlooktoo shot the white man to save Harrigan—a purely unselfish act—yet Kudlooktoo considers that he committed a great sin, and recently made full confession of it after having become a Christian.

This theory is of particular significance to us now because practically every school of psychology presents self-realization as the ideal end-motive for all life, and evil or sin is defined as the failure to reach that ideal. Hadfield puts the idea thus: "The ideal is that the attainment of which produces completeness and self-realization. It is at once that which stimulates the will to activity, and that which determines the direction and character of activities."[13] And, "There is no such thing as evil in itself. Evil is not a thing, but a wrong function; it is the use of a good impulse at the wrong time, in the wrong place, toward a wrong end. . . . To the psycho-physician there are no vices in their own right, there are only perverted virtues. . . . Evil, like dirt, is misplaced matter, or, rather, misdirected function, valuable in itself, noxious if out of place."[14]

---

[13] Hadfield, *Psychology and Morals*, p. 109. Reprinted by permission of Robert H. McBride & Company, publishers, New York.

[14] Hadfield, pp. 165-66.

Hocking puts the same idea into these words: "Sin is the deliberate failure to interpret an impulse so that it will confirm or increase the integration of selfhood."[15] The cure for evil or sin is considered to lie in the realization of the highest self through reassociation and sublimation of the instinct impulses in altruistic endeavors, but always the end-motive is full self-realization.

The trouble, of course, with this idea is that it fails to recognize the objective standard of virtue that is in Christ, a standard higher than the highest we could ever attain through the medium of self-realization alone. Also, as pointed out in Chapter III, self-realization as a motive cannot stand the test of psychology. Self-realization as the end-motive for life could bring only stagnation for the individual and for the race. To perfectly realize our own personal goals, while it might result in satisfaction for ourselves, would end all progress toward ultimate perfection, for it would bring complete balance between our ego and our ego ideal, and absolute balance means the end of all movement either up or down.

Sin as Lawlessness. William Hodge, speaking in the last generation, supported a concept of the nature of sin which is still quite commonly

[15] Hocking, *Human Nature and Its Remaking*, p. 141.

held. He said that, according to the Protestant doctrine, sin is always the breaking of the law of God. "The Protestant churches at the time of the Reformation did not attempt to determine the nature of sin philosophically. They regarded it neither as a necessary limitation, . . . nor as having its seat in man's sensuous nature, nor as consisting in selfishness alone . . . Founding their doctrine on their moral and religious consciousness and upon the Word of God, they declared sin to be the transgression of or want of conformity to the divine law."[16] They incorporated this conception in their various articles of faith.

The theory is of interest to us because of the attention given to the study of crime as the result of a spirit of lawlessness. The crime wave in the United States that began about the year 1923 is considered by some to have been the direct result of a rebellion to all law growing out of antagonism to the Prohibition law. Psychology lends its aid to this reckoning in its discovery that a negative suggestion may get a positive response. A child who is told "Don't!" often responds by performing the forbidden action, and most grown-ups seem to be affected with the same virus.

Law is defined in the dictionary as either

[16] Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, vol. ii, p. 180.

the rule of conduct that prescribes human activity, or the uniform occurrence or recurrence of the phenomena of nature; divine law must be defined according to one or the other of these meanings. If it is considered to be analogous to the law of a nation or a society, it means an authoritative rule directing the behavior of humans. If it is considered to be analogous to the laws of nature, it means that our souls were made to act in certain ways, and when we change the mode of action we sin, just as when we break the laws of nature we come to grief.

In either case the law must be embodied in a personality before it becomes potent in the direction of our lives. Our civil law has efficacy only as it is embodied in the representatives of the judicial and administrative departments of our government. The law of the Old Testament was embodied in the anthropomorphic Jehovah. The law of perfect love apart from its embodiment in Jesus would be a whimsical and baseless vagary without power to regulate life. The same is true if we define God's law by analogy to the laws of nature. For example, the law of gravitation does not bind us to the earth or the earth to the sun; it is merely the statement of a condition, the description of a fact. There is the attraction

of two material bodies, one toward the other, and the law describes the action. On the other hand, some bodies repel each other when they differ violently. Our spirits are attracted or repelled by the spirit of Jesus. It is as we are attracted and become one with him or are repelled and separate ourselves from him that we become saints or sinners. The law describing our action would be the law of God if we are attracted to Jesus, but it would be the law of evil if we are repelled by him. The law is merely descriptive of what happens.

As pointed out earlier in this discussion,[17] only when an abstract idea is actively exhibited in a definite character or personality can it affect life. So we can know the law of God only as it is evidenced in the life of Christ, and we can know the sin of our lives only by the measure of their deviation from the standard set in his life.

Sin, then, is not lawlessness except as the divine law is personified in Christ.

Sin Is Putting Self Above God. Sin may be committed through the avenues of our sensuous bodies, or because of selfishness, or by breaking the law of God, but all sin, whether overt or confined to the mind, is the evidence of a feeling of self-sufficiency. It is the confidence

[17] See quotation from McDougall, p. 73.

that our own concepts, ideals, and actions are always right. We are not satisfied to let the ideal of Christ be our guide; we set the standard of our own life. This proposition is also maintained by at least one school of psychology. Christianity says sin is putting oneself before God. Adler says that all psychic evil is the result of a desire to be like God in power over persons, situations, and things.

There is a difference that must be noted between selfishness and putting self before God. Selfishness means the satisfaction of the pleasure principle. But there is sin which is not hedonistic in its origin. Kudlooktoo had no pleasure in the shooting of Marvin. It must have been done in agony of soul. But it was done in an attitude of self-sufficiency. He took the administration of justice into his own hands. All peoples condemn this attitude in communal life. Lynchings and the activities of those who administer justice, even in a good cause, without recourse to a court of justice, are always rightly denounced.

This definition of the essence of sin is applicable to all sin, from the basest sins of the flesh to perverted virtues. It applies to the murderer, the thief, and the libertine. It applies also to the sinning pharisaical pillar of the church. Each is a sinner because he sets

his own standard for his thinking and acting, and judges others according to this standard. He does not seek to know God's standard.

Much that is in the various religions of the world has grown up around this attitude and there is some justification in the cynicism that "man has made God in his own image." Man has wanted a God who would do his bidding and accomplish things beyond the possibility of man's own power; to keep off demons, or the plague; to save him from enemies, or from suffering; to keep the sun shining, or to cause rain. Man has not yet arrived at the place where above everything else he wants a God who is like Christ and a God who demands that he really follow him in all the doings of his life. When man does follow him in truth, he will attain sinlessness.

The essence of sin is putting self above God; guiding our own lives by our own standards; directing the lives of others according to our own notions of what is right and wrong for them; and organizing society to conform to our own wishes; in no case seeking to establish the kingdom of God or to bring our own lives into agreement with the standard of Christ. Sin is self-sufficiency.

CHAPTER V

ORIGINAL SIN AND THE UNITY OF THE RACE

(The Existence of Sin)

A. The Cause of Sin

The nature of sin has been described in many ways, and many theories have been proposed as to that which constitutes the essence of sin. In like manner also there have been many attempts made to account for the existence of sin in the race, and several answers have been offered to the perplexing question, What makes us sin? The easy rejoinder that man is born with a congenital perversity or an innate contrariness is not an adequate solution. It merely sets the problem further back. Those who have seriously sought an ultimate explanation have gravitated into several camps of thought. In general, these explanations can be classed as Pelagian, Augustinian, or Semi-Pelagian.[1]

Pelagianism. About the year 400 A. D. a British monk named Pelagius journeyed to Rome.

[1] For the exposition of these systems I am indebted to Moxon, *The Doctrine of Sin;* Moxley, *Predestination;* Müller, *The Christian Doctrine of Sin;* Hodge, *Systematic Theology;* and Strong, *Systematic Theology.*

In his far-off island home he had visioned the Eternal City as the Holy City, the one place on earth which could give a foretaste of what one might hope for in the kingdom of heaven. He looked for simplicity of life and purity of soul. He expected consecrated leaders and inspired followers. He thought to find the spirit of Christ ruling in the hearts of men. Instead he found the courts of the church surrounded by splendor and luxury beyond the fondest dreams of the rulers of this world. He found sophistication, political intrigue, and social corruption. He soon saw that this submission to Mammon was the outgrowth of a false philosophy. Men had come to believe that original sin as introduced into the race by Adam had so completely rid mankind of the power to become and to remain virtuous that they were left totally depraved and unable to do right except through the grace of God. This belief led them to submit to the promptings of temptation, believing themselves to be too weak to resist. It led them to excuse themselves and to bemoan, not their sin, but the poverty of grace with which God had endowed them.

In order to offset this harmful belief, Pelagius began vigorously to preach and to teach the absolute freedom of the will, and the complete

responsibility of every individual for the direction of his own life. Because his doctrine was compounded in the heat of controversy, his principles came to be expressed in extreme terms. He asserted that God's grace was manifested in all the good gifts which he had bestowed upon the race and special grace was not bestowed upon chosen individuals making them more virtuous than others. The chief gift received by man, and common to all men, was the power to choose between right and wrong. In this choice man is absolutely free. His will is the sole determining agent. He can at all times, and at any time, without bias or propensity from his own history or heritage, choose equally between good and evil. Adam's sin left no taint on the race and no predilection for sin except a bad example. The cause of sin was not to be found in inherent weakness or in a tendency, but in a wrong will. We sin not because we are influenced by our nature, but because we want to sin.

Pelagius had many ardent adherents at the time of his controversy, but his theory in its entirety could not stand the test of philosophical reasoning. The Pelagians were forced by the logic of their own teaching to conclude that sin is not universal, and that many have lived without sin. They even enumerated those in

the Old Testament whose lives had been free from the power of sin—Abel, Enoch, Melchizedek, etc. They also were compelled to assume that no sin affects the character in such a way as to influence any other choice. These two errors were sufficient to prevent the theory from becoming a doctrine of the church. Pelagianism served a good purpose, however, in bringing a counterbalance against Augustinianism.

Augustinianism. With the entry of Pelagius into the field of polemical theology it became necessary for Augustine to clarify and define his position. Before the advent of this zealot from the north Augustine's utterances on the subject of sin, original sin, and redeeming grace had been accepted without any demand for logical support. Now, however, every proposal was questioned as to the authenticity of the premise and the logic of the conclusion. Under this aggressive onslaught Augustine was compelled to explain every statement and to follow the leading of his thought to its ultimate inferences. The result was the clear exposition of his beliefs and the molding of them into a logical system. This system has been the orthodox, though not the unchallenged, doctrine of the church.

By self-examination Augustine had con-

cluded that his own sin was in his emotions as well as in his acts, that it had always been in his life, and that he was guilty because of it, and he felt impotent to cast off its thralldom. He saw the evidence of the same experience in the lives of others. With this consciousness and his knowledge of the Bible he developed his theology. Adam was made in the image of God, and with perfect holiness. He sinned. The result of his sin was estrangement from God for himself and for all of his descendants. He not only lost his holiness, but he lost his power to become holy and the ability to do anything good. This total depravity was also handed down to all of his progeny, who shared with him both his punishment and his guilt. Redemption from sin came only through Christ, and came only to the chosen few who were drawn away from their sin and into the fellowship of the redeemed through the effectual grace of God.

Augustine sought to keep from admitting the inferences made by his system, but the pressure brought to bear by his opponents forced him to follow his own logic to its furthest implications. He was made to deny the practical freedom of the will, for if man enters the world totally depraved and unable to do anything good, he sins of necessity, not of choice. And

if the redeemed are saved only by the irresistible grace of God and the damned cannot help themselves, man does not in any degree shape his own destiny. He was also made to consign all unbaptized infants to eternal hell, for if baptism is necessary for forgiveness, even of the elect, and if all mankind share the guilt of Adam's sin and are therefore worthy of eternal punishment, then unbaptized infants are unredeemed. His belief in the congenital inheritance of evil led him to look upon human propagation as itself sinful, and in spite of his attempts to prove the contrary his philosophy condemns marriage. His system led him also to the theory of an absolute and unchangeable predestination.

Semi-Pelagianism. The doctrines of Augustine were accepted as orthodox by the Councils of the church, but it was not long before the defects of the system were recognized and opposed by men who in no sense were in sympathy with the contradictory views of Pelagius. They appreciated what wise men have always known, that truth moves forward along a middle course while philosophic reasoning tacks from one extreme to another. In large measure the rise of the Semi-Pelagians was due to the oft-repeated succession of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis. They sought to

separate from each system that which was best and most reasonable and to incorporate these elements into a new and more common-sense body of doctrine.

While there were many differences within their own camp there was general unity in certain points. They united in rejecting the Pelagian belief that Adam's sin injured only himself, and in opposing Augustine's doctrine of the imputation of Adam's guilt to all of his posterity. They rejected Pelagius' idea of unbiased freedom in every choice between good and evil, and they refused to accept Augustine's dictum that man is totally depraved and unable to do anything good. They repudiated both the Pelagian view that man is the sole master of his fate and Augustine's unconditional predestination. They believed that the sin of the first man left its mark on all men and made them prone to evil and slothful in that which is good. They held that man can, of his own choice, turn to the good in preference to the evil; and that there is in all of us an indestructible spark of goodness which, if properly nurtured, can, with the help of God's grace, lead us into all virtue. They taught that there is a taint left on the race by the sin of Adam, but it is a taint that can be removed if man will turn to the Great Physician

for healing and help. The responsible agent is always the individual human being.

The Modern Position. Most modern theories explaining the existence of sin can be grouped in one or the other of the above classifications.

Pure Pelagianism, because of its quite evident fallacies, has not had many protagonists in modern times. There is, however, a measure of Pelagianism shown by Kant in his declaration that "there is nothing in the world, or even out of it, that can be called good, except a good will."[2] And he shows that he believes the converse to be also true in his explanation of the "radical evil" in man having its origin in man's adoption of it by free-will choice. Tennant also seems to approach toward Pelagianism in his continual insistence that sin is only the intentional transgression of a moral law which is known and understood. He does not assume that choice between good and evil is always free, although he asserts that when it is free and evil is chosen, that alone is sin.

As stated before, Augustinianism has been the orthodox doctrine of the church, both Roman and Protestant. It was accepted by the Councils and Popes of the Roman Church and appropriated by the Reformers, both Luther and Calvin carrying its logic to its most disas-

[2] Kant, *Practical Reason*, p. 227.

trous conclusions. It is still the doctrine of narrow orthodoxy. Hodge, who is still considered the authority of the ultra-orthodox, says: "The affirmative statements on this subject [i. e., original sin and the resulting corruption] are: (1) That this corruption of nature affects the whole soul. (2) That it consists in the loss or absence of original righteousness, and consequent entire moral depravity of our nature, including or manifesting itself in an aversion from all spiritual good, or from God, and an inclination to all evil. (3) That it is truly and properly of the nature of sin, involving both guilt and pollution. (4) That it retains its character as sin even in the regenerated. (5) That it renders the soul spiritually dead, so that the natural, or unrenewed man, is entirely unable of himself to do anything good in the sight of God."[3]

Most of us, however, like Arminius, prefer the middle course charted by the Semi-Pelagians. While we recognize an inherent tendency to sin, introduced into the race at some stage in its development by the commission of the first overt act of evil, we deny that we are guilty because of that sin, for, as Principal John Caird has observed, "Rightly construed the conception of seminal guilt or of sin which

[3] Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, vol. ii, p. 230.

contains or involves all future sins, if any real meaning could be attached to it, would seem to imply that Adam was guilty of all the sins of his descendants, rather than they of his."[4] Also, while it is freely admitted that it is only by the grace of God that we finally attain salvation from sin, yet it must be insisted that man takes the first step. Jesus himself said so in the quotation used by the Semi-Pelagians, "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you."[5] Likewise in the application of the parables recounted in Luke, Chapter 15, the joy in heaven is occasioned in each case because the sinner has repented. In the parable of the prodigal son, although the father saw him afar off and welcomed him with rejoicing, it was only after the wanderer "came to himself" in the far country and made the long journey homeward.

The modern position is the Semi-Pelagian view that there is a bias for evil in all men; that it is original sin in the sense that it resulted from the first sin committed in the race; that man is not totally depraved, but has a spark of

---

[4] Caird, *Fundamental Ideas of Christianity*, vol. i, p. 211, quoted by Bicknell, *The Christian Idea of Sin and Original Sin*, p. 33.

[5] Matt. 7. 7.

goodness; and if he "follow the gleam," it will lead him to God.

B. Support From the New Psychology

Unity of the Race. A species is a group of animals or plants that differ among themselves in minor points, but differ so completely from the members of other species as to be generally quite easily recognized. A species is both homogeneous and homogenous; its members are alike in structure and in progeny. A species can continue in fertile reproduction by interbreeding, and in general, sharply defined species cannot cross-breed. The great strides taken in biological knowledge during the last century, while definitely establishing man's kinship with the lower animals, have also established his identity as a distinct and separate species. He satisfies the above definition in being completely different from other species, alike in structure and in progeny with the others of his own species, and able to propagate only by interbreeding. Biologically man is a unity.

The psychologists have now established man's psychical oneness. It has been demonstrated that man acts and reacts in regular ways that are common to all men, ways that might be described as laws of action. It has also been

shown that man is a cohesive unity; that is, there is an affinity existing between the most different types and races of men that does not exist in any degree between any men and the lower animals. It has been shown that man, while only a little lower than the angels at his highest development, is infinitely above the other animals at his lowest.

Man's Cohesive Unity. The cohesive unity of the race has been made evident to the psychologists in two phenomena observed. The first is the mass of psychic material which is common in the heritage of all men, and the second is the operation of the herd instinct throughout various national groups and in mankind generally.

It has become more and more manifest, as the psychologists have enlarged their knowledge of the human soul, that there is in every individual a body of psychic matter that is his, not because of his family traits, or his national characteristics, but because of his membership in humanity. McDougall describes it rather vaguely as something apart from the individuals that compose the race and yet affecting their behavior, "The aggregate which is society," he says, "has, in virtue of its past history, positive qualities which it does not derive from the units which compose it at any one time;

and in virtue of these qualities it acts upon its units in a manner very different from that in which the units as such interact with one another."[6] Jung, however, very definitely describes it as the "collective unconscious" and this conception forms one of the basic principles in his system. It is the stock of knowledge and ability, acquired during the evolutionary progress of the race, and inherited by all the members of the species. It is not instinct, nor can it be described as race habits of action and thought. It is, rather, the body of concepts and ideas consciously arrived at by preceding generations and transmitted to all of their descendants as part of their unconscious psychic equipment. It is by this means that myths and legends of the same nature have cropped up in widely separated places and among peoples differing greatly in their customs and beliefs. Fundamental religious beliefs common to religions differing radically in modes and manners of worship are also said to be the result of primordial images being expressed through the collective unconscious. This psychic material is constantly being added to by the new discoveries and higher concepts attained by each succeeding generation. Our personal uncon-

[6] McDougall, *The Group Mind*, p. 7. Reprinted by permission of G. P. Putnam's Sons, publishers, New York.

scious is the unconscious element in our psychic natures which has resulted from our own experiences, concepts, and repressions. This obviously differs greatly in all and separates us one from the other. But the collective unconscious is common property, and binds us with a common bond, for we are sharers of a common birthright. "I am so profoundly convinced of this homogeneity of the human psyche," says Jung, "that I have actually embraced it in the concept of the collective unconscious, as a universal and homogeneous substratum whose homogeneity extends even into a world-wide identity or similarity of myths and fairy tales; so that a Negro in the Southern States of America dreams in the motives of Grecian mythology, and a Swiss grocer's apprentice repeats in his psychosis the vision of an Egyptian Gnostic."[7]

The study of social, group, crowd, and herd psychology has resulted in the discovery that man is a gregarious animal and that his life is guided and his thoughts are molded largely through the influence of the herd instinct. McDougall defines the instincts as "certain innate specific tendencies of the mind that are common to all members of any one species, racial characters that have been slowly evolved

[7] Jung, *Psychological Types*, p. 624.

in the process of adaptation of species to their environment and that can be neither eradicated from the mental constitution of which they are innate elements nor acquired by the individuals in the course of their lifetime."[8] Using this conception, Trotter asserts that there are impulses that come from herd feeling with the power of instincts.[9] For that reason, he calls the sum total of these impulses the herd instinct. This herd instinct operates in man in much the same way as it does in the lower animals and in his national life man clearly shows the effect of the herd instinct in his social and political organization. He cites examples of national life organized around the herd instinct in order to demonstrate his theory. The national life of some peoples has been organized around the aggressive type of herd instinct, exemplified in nature by the wolf. Others have been organized around the protective type of herd instinct, exemplified in nature by the sheep, and still others around the socialized type, exemplified by the bee.[10]

---

[8] McDougall, *Social Psychology*, pp. 23-24.

[9] Trotter, *Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War*. Reprinted by permission of The Macmillan Company, publishers, New York.

[10] Trotter, *Ibid.*, pp. 171ff. Reprinted by permission of The Macmillan Company, publishers, New York.

This part of Trotter's book was written during the intense days of the Great War when nation was risen up against nation, when boundaries between peoples were hard and fast, and when racial differences were amplified. Since then we have found that we are more nearly alike. One nation cannot be put down as possessing a particular type of herd instinct to the exclusion of the other types. Germany, for example, was described by Trotter in 1915 as the aggressive type of herd, exemplified in nature by the wolf. His description was right at the time, but it would hardly hold now. At present Germany more closely resembles the socialized type, represented by the bee. A change in leadership has changed the organization of the group. In China we have witnessed another great change. In times past China was organized around the socialized type of herd instinct with the bee as its prototype in nature. With the arrival of the West at the doors of the East in the seventeenth century, China became organized around the protective type, and to-day we see her vigorously expressing herself according to the aggressive type. No nation can be classed as ever and always belonging to one or another type. These designations serve for all peoples at different periods in their national life. In a

general way they can be applied to the development of civilization in mankind at large. If we look back over the story of man's development, we find that he originally gathered with others of his kind for purposes of protection in caves, or in secluded valleys among high hills. At a later stage of development he found that to keep himself and his race alive he must forage for food. This developed an aggressive wolf-pack instinct, which became so strong in man that from hunting wild animals he turned to hunting other men and the long series of wars that have been a curse to mankind resulted. It would appear that we are entering upon the socialized stage, when each will do his share of work for the good of all.

All of which shows that the types postulated by Trotter for different nationalities do not belong to the different nations, but are part of the herd instinct of the race. Under black, red, brown, yellow, and white skins and beneath the superficialities of our various national manners and customs, mankind thinks, feels, and acts in much the same way and for the same reasons, over all the earth. When national barriers are down we see men receptive to the spirit of the larger herd. In the United States the Negro, the Jew, the Latin, and the Nordic become Americans. They do not inter-

marry and become homogenous, but they are homogeneous, responsive to the call of the larger herd. As the dividing chasms between countries are being bridged by modern transportation, the interchange of literature and art, and the economic interdependence of peoples, we find that response to the larger herd suggestion is active. Turks wear English bowler hats, Chinese enjoy American moving pictures, and Persians play Scottish golf.

At the core of this herd instinct is the suggestibility of the individuals composing the herd. "The members of the herd must possess sensitiveness to the behavior of their fellows. . . . Each member of the flock tending to follow its neighbor, and in turn to be followed."[11] The herd instinct is not the result of the suggestibility of its members, but this suggestibility is the evidence of the unity of the herd.

Unity in Action. The psychoanalysts by exploring within the unconscious of men have discovered that this common inherited psychic material and this herd suggestibility are active in varying degrees in all men, and influence to a large extent the thoughts, feelings, and acts of their lives. "Through the investigation of these

[11] Trotter, *Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War*, p. 29. Reprinted by permission of The Macmillan Company, publishers, New York.

different avenues leading into the hidden depths of the human being and through the revelation of the motives and influences at work there, although astonishing to the uninitiated, a very clear and definite conception of the actual human relationship—brotherhood—of all mankind is obtained. It is this recognition of these common factors, basically inherent in humanity from the beginning and still active, which is at once both the most helpful and the most feared and disliked part of psychoanalysis."[12]

This unity is evident in man's progress as an individual and as a race, and it is manifest likewise in his retrogression.

In the early days of psychoanalysis it was pointed out by Freud that the instincts are purposive tendencies, or strivings after the attainment of certain ends or goals. Earlier psychology had defined an instinct as an action pattern, an inborn habit of response to a certain defined stimulus, a reflex arc in the nervous system. Freud's new concept of the instinct changed the complexion of all modern psychology, of other schools as well as psychoanalysis. In the beginning he saw a group of conflicting instincts each striving for its own satisfaction, the attainment of its own goal;

[12] Dr. Beatrice Hinkle, Translator's Introduction of Jung's *Psychology of the Unconscious*, p. xxvi.

but continued research led him to the recognition of a "reality principle" as the guiding motive of all, a predominant design for the complete life that blended the various instincts into a unity. He denies that such a principle has influenced the progressive evolution of mankind as a whole, although he admits that there has been such a development and his whole system is built on the theory that man is a purposive animal, conceiving ends worthy of his effort and directing his life toward the accomplishment of those ends. The other psychoanalysts, however, either imply or assert that there is in each of us an impulse to rise to our highest conceivable possibilities. Adler supports the idea of such a hormic psychology when he says, "Every psychological phenomenon, if it is to give us any understanding of a person, can only be grasped and understood if regarded as a preparation for some goal."[13] Jung, with his concept of a collective unconscious constantly being built up by succeeding generations, holds the same view. And William McDougall founds his theory of the character of man's psyche upon the recognition of human nature . . . "as everywhere and always manifesting purposive strivings."[14]

[13] Adler, *Individual Psychology*, p. 4.

[14] McDougall, *Outline of Abnormal Psychology*, p. 24.

There is also general agreement that there is unity in retrogression. Individuals come under the power of neuroses according to certain psychological rules that have been formulated. There is difference of opinion as to the stimuli that provide the cause of the neuroses, whether sex, a feeling of inferiority, a "Terrible Mother" motive or something else, but there is agreement that the path of the neurosis is by way of conscious or unconscious repression or traumatic experience.[15] And there is agreement as to the manner in which neuroses may find expression in the conscious life of the neurotic, through functional disorders, symptomatic acts, compensative phantasies, libido fixations, etc.

In addition there is general concord among the psychologists in the assumption that none of us escapes from some measure of disintegration, a disintegration growing out of unwanted impulses or repressed memories of unpleasant experiences. With normal persons this

---

[15] A traumatic experience is a strong external stimulus so distasteful to the conscious mind that a barrier is erected and the memory and reaction to the stimulus pass directly into the unconscious. Many soldiers during the Great War passed through horrible experiences that they could not recall, but which had tremendous and harmful effects on their lives. (See Freud, *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*, Chap. IV, and McDougall, *Outline of Abnormal Psychology*, cases 5, 7, 8, 9, etc.)

disintegration does not develop into a neurosis, but it nevertheless makes itself felt in our everyday life by slips of the tongue and pen, ceremonial acts, the things we are prone to forget, the things we never forget, and other similar manifestations of the lack of complete conscious control.

There is also much evidence in the work of the new psychologists that we are all less perfect than we might be; that there are great possibilities for idealistic progress which we universally reject. Freud himself vindicates Paul. The apostle asserts that "all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God."[16] The greatest of the psychoanalysts agrees. "Psychoanalysis here confirms," he says, "what the pious were wont to say—that we are all miserable sinners."[17] Freud is not supporting the Christian doctrine of sin, but he is underlining the universal human tendency to choose ends of lower moral worth when the possibility exists of following higher ideals.

C. Original Sin

It becomes evident that there is much in the new psychology which confirms the position of

[16] Rom. 3. 23.

[17] Freud, *Totem and Taboo*, p. 121. Reprinted by permission of Dodd, Mead and Company, New York.

the Semi-Pelagians. The Semi-Pelagians maintained that sin was introduced into the race by the first man; that the guilt of that first sin was not imputed to the descendants of the first man, but that a bias for sin was left in human nature as a result; that this tendency becomes active in every individual and results in the universality of sin; that there is in each a spark of goodness, which, if followed, will lead to God. Each of these tenets finds scientific confirmation in the new psychology.

The Effect of the First Sin. It has been firmly established that man does not live unto himself. His membership in the herd widens the sphere of his influence. The effect of his actions is always evident in similar actions by other members of his group—"Each member of the flock tending to follow its neighbor and in turn to be followed."[18] Not only does individual action affect others in the same generation, but it leaves its mark in the race so that following generations tend to repeat the action of their forbears. The past history of mankind has so influenced its psychic make-up that the aggregate which is society has a positive influence upon the actions of its members.[19] This influence, says Jung, is the

[18] See Trotter, quoted above.

[19] See McDougall, quoted above.

result of the accumulated experience of mankind, the inheritance of acquired psychic characteristics. It makes us think in images we cannot consciously recognize, feel emotions which are inexplainable by the stimuli that bring them into activity, and perform acts which are contrary to our conscious desires. That is to say, whatever man does, he does as a member of society, and his actions influence the life of his group and leave their trace in the collective unconscious of the race. If he sins, he leaves a smudge, not only on his own character, but on the character of others. He leaves the taint of sin in the inheritable psychic material of humanity.

Someone First Committed Sin. There must have been a time when man was perfectly integrated for that particular phase of his development. There must have been a time between the acquirement of a moral sense and the first breach of that morality when man was sinless. Whoever it was that committed that first sin introduced sin into the race and left a mark that humanity alone has never been able to erase. In the language of psychology, he left a primordial tendency for evil in the collective unconscious which influences the lives of all members of the race so that all tend to do wrong. This is Original Sin.

Since, due to the power of the herd instinct, each tends to follow his neighbor, the man who committed the first sin not only set the primordial tendency to sin, but he set the example which has resulted in the universality of sin. With an inherited propensity for evil within, and a herd example of wickedness without, we all sin. The wolf inherits a tendency to kill and a responsiveness to the pack. When he senses the impulse to attack, he joins in the assault. Man inherits a tendency to sin and a sensitiveness to the behavior of his fellows. When they sin, he sins. It is a commonplace that men in crowds are far more prone to do evil than are the same men when acting alone. It is because of their inherited tendency and their herd suggestibility. Together, these are the cause of the universality of sin.

This inherent tendency and herd suggestibility not only bind us with the past, but also place a heavy responsibility on us for the future. Original sin is responsible for the universality of sin, but the universality of sin adds to the weight of original sin. For every act of sin not only sets an example of wickedness, but it also leaves an increased tendency to do evil in the collective unconscious of mankind. Thus, every time we choose the wrong we add to the

burden of original sin that must be borne by the race; we increase the power of the tendency to do evil that future generations will inherit.

The Spark of Goodness. Plutarch tells the parable of a man who attempted to make a dead body stand upright. He tried different postures and various schemes of balancing, but without success. Finally he gave up the effort, saying, "There is something lacking inside." The parable finely illustrates the Augustinian position that man is totally depraved and unable to do anything good. Only by a miracle from God can he receive the abundant life that Jesus came to bring. He can of himself do nothing to help himself. Only if God chooses can he be made to stand upright.

It is recognized that Jesus gave life to the widow of Nain's son, called Lazarus from the tomb, and raised Jairus' daughter, when each was beyond human help. But it was only after the leper saw Jesus and fell on his face before him, beseeching him, "Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean," that Jesus "stretched forth his hand, and touched him, saying, I will; be thou made clean."[20] Only when the blind men followed him, saying, "Have mercy on us, thou Son of David," did Jesus touch their eyes and answer, "According

[20] Luke 5. 12, 13.

to your faith be it done unto you."[21] Some of us believe that if we seek Christ we shall find him; and if we follow him we shall hear him say, "According to your faith be it done unto you." Then shall we be clean and walk in the light of a new day.

This is the Semi-Pelagian view; that there is a spark of goodness in every man, which if he follow, will lead him to Christ, where he will receive life abundant.

This position is also supported by the new psychology. Freud asserts that "we are all miserable sinners," but there is in each of us an ego ideal which is better than we are, a "reality principle" that seeks to mold our life according to a worthy standard. As pointed out before,[22] there is lack of integration in the life until the real ego and the ego ideal meet on the same ground. This cannot be accomplished until the ego is raised to the ego ideal.[23] When that is achieved, perfect integration will result.

The "reality principle" is the "spark of goodness," and "perfect integration" is "abundant life." The terminology is different, but the experiences are the same.

---

[21] Matt. 9. 27-29.
[22] P. 49.
[23] Pp. 50, 58.

CHAPTER VI

TEMPTATION AND THE UNCONSCIOUS IMPULSE

(The Operation of Sin)

A. The Unconscious Impulse

If the collective unconscious has, as part of its equipment, a tendency to do evil, and if the suggestibility inherent in the herd instinct induces every individual to follow the lead of the race into actual sin, there is still the question to be answered, What is it that causes the submission to the tendency and the response to the suggestion? The reply is to be found in the phenomenon discovered by the psychoanalysts and named the unconscious impulse. It is an impulse arising out of the unconscious, but seeking active expression in the conscious life. It is an inner desire or urge to act in a certain way.

It Is Not an Obsessional Impulse. It is necessary to differentiate between the unconscious impulse and the obsessional impulse. One is normal and the other is abnormal. An unconscious impulse is a spontaneous suggestion made by the unconscious to the consciousness

proposing that the ego act in a particular manner. It brings the weight of the emotions to its aid in seeking to influence the ego to the form of action it desires. But it is only a suggestion. Even with the added power of urge brought by the force of emotional excitation, it is still just a suggestion, to be examined by the consciousness, and accepted, rejected, or transformed in its expression. When such an impulse becomes irresistible and beyond the control or guidance of the conscious mind, it is then what Freud has called an "obsessional impulse," or what Adler terms an "imperative intuition."

An obsessional impulse is always the evidence of some lack of integration. It is the libido of some repressed desire finding an outlet in a disguised form. If the repressed desire or unpleasant memory which brings the obsessional impulse into existence is not too violently antagonistic to the beliefs and ideals of the conscious mind, the resulting obsessional act does not disturb the normal mental balance of the individual. Most of us, if we searched our lives, would find some commonplace activity which we always perform with a moderate degree of ceremonial. We call such acts "mannerisms," or evidences of our peculiar temperament, but they are always symptomatic

of a repression, however slight, and symbolic of the nature of the unconscious wish. When the desire or memory is of such a distasteful nature that the conscious mind refuses to harbor even the thought and with vigor suppresses the suggestion, the repression resulting may develop a neurosis of a serious nature. An unconscious impulse, on the contrary, is quite normal and never the evidence of disintegration. If not given expression, either in natural or in sublimated form, it may, through being repressed, cause an obsessional impulse or a compulsion neurosis, but in its first manifestation it is entirely normal and is a natural phase of the psychic activity of every individual, even of a perfectly integrated personality. An obsessional impulse is a repressed desire forcing expression of itself, while an unconscious impulse is a natural desire seeking expression.

Another difference to be noted is in the nature and relevance of the actions urged upon the ego by the two kinds of impulse. An obsessional impulse is a command from the unconscious to perform a certain act without any consideration of its reasonableness. The act may have no logical connection with the conscious activity of the moment. It may be trivial and to no apparent purpose. Yet it must be done to secure peace of mind. A man

may feel impelled to wash his hands after having just finished that operation. He may be forced to touch something he would rather not touch, or to count the windows in a building, the steps in a staircase, or the houses in a block, to no object. If he fails to obey the unconscious command, his mind is not at rest until he return and fulfill the obligation. This is the obsessional impulse; without reason or purpose it demands satisfaction. It is a suppressed wish expressing itself under the cloak of disguise. The unconscious impulse, on the other hand, always presents its suggestion with the support of some motive or end to be desired. It offers to the consciousness not only the urge to act in a certain way, but accompanies the suggestion with arguments for the reasonableness and wisdom of such action. And it always makes itself felt in a situation in which its expression would seem relevant and meaningful.

It Is an Effort of the Unconscious to Affect Behavior. The unconscious impulse is an effort of the unconscious to affect the behavior of the ego in order that the content of the unconscious may be given satisfactory expression in the conscious life. If we remember Jung's description of the psychic material which composes the unconscious, we shall be able to determine the

nature of the impulses which may arise.[1] The impulse may be from a native instinct seeking expression. The unconscious is the seat of the instincts, each of which seeks satisfaction in the conscious life of the individual. The various instincts are of varying power in different persons, but they all seek expression according to their strength. Or the impulse may arise out of the memories of the personal unconscious, forgotten by the conscious mind, but active in the unconscious. We are often impelled to act in a particular way because of the feeling of assurance that we have acted thus before, although there is no memory trace of such action in the consciousness. The impulse may also come out of the collective unconscious. Because of the psychic experience in the race we may feel the urge to act in a manner prescribed by that experience. When the impulse arises out of a repression, as already pointed out, it is generally an obsessional impulse.

It must be noted that every unconscious impulse is an attempt by the unconscious to gain satisfaction. Freud has pointed out that the processes of the unconscious are not related to external reality, but are concerned only with their own gratification. "They are sub-

[1] For the digest of Jung's Concept of the Unconscious, see p. 49.

ject to the pleasure principle;" he says, "their fate depends only upon the degree of their strength and upon their conformity to regulation by pleasure and pain."[2] They are not interested in meeting the demands of the ego ideal or of aiding in the integration of the personality. Their one aim is to gain pleasurable gratification for themselves.

Because of this insistent demand on the part of the unconscious impulses and because of the recognition of the danger of refusing them proper and sufficient expression, there have been many who have advocated their full and free display. This advocacy has grown out of a failure to understand fully the nature of our conscious and unconscious minds as discovered by the psychoanalysts, and the interrelation of the one with the other. The unconscious is guided by the pleasure principle and the conscious by the reality principle. The unconscious must find expression for its libido, an outlet for its instinct energy, but if psychic difficulty is to be avoided, the expression in the conscious life must be in accordance with the ego ideal and in the light of the reality principle. It is just as harmful psychically to repress the moral standards of the consciousness as to refuse expression to the unconscious

[2] Freud, *Collected Papers*, vol. iv, p. 119.

impulses. Freud constantly reiterates that the only means of acquiring and of maintaining mental health is by "making the unconscious conscious." The only person who is mentally normal guides his life in that way. "We may say that as long as the system Cs (Freud's contraction for the consciousness) controls activity and motility, the mental condition of the person in question may be called normal."[3] The person, on the other hand, who gives free vent to all of his unconscious impulses, who fails to bring their expression into conformity with the reality principle of his consciousness, may just as truly be called abnormal.

Many unconscious impulses are in complete accord with the reality principle of the consciousness and their expression is an aid to integration. When a man is hungry it is quite normal for him to seek to satisfy the impulse to eat. Such activity is in keeping with the reality principle of the ego ideal and is an aid to the integration of the personality, for it satisfies a native instinct in accord with his conscious knowledge of what is best for his whole person. When, however, a man eats, not to satisfy his hunger instinct, nor to nourish his body, but eats beyond his needs to the

[3] Freud, *Collected Papers*, vol. iv, p. 111.

extreme of satiety, merely for the accompanying pleasure of partaking of good food, he is satisfying the unconscious impulse that has arisen with the sight or thought of the food, but he is not satisfying his higher conscious knowledge of what is best. He is not seeking to satisfy his instinct, but to gain pleasure through the exercise of his emotions. Likewise, the emotions associated with the sex instinct may be whipped into activity by unnatural stimuli and the instinct gain expression in ways which are antagonistic to the ego ideal, merely for the pleasurable exercise of the emotions. Such activity in each case is very dangerous. At best it prevents integration, for it keeps the ego from developing toward its ego ideal. At worst it may cause a neurosis with the complete repression of the conscious life standards. The first man becomes a glutton; the second ends as a sexual pervert.

As pointed out by William James, and confirmed by the later psychologists,[4] every psychological process to be complete must pass through the three stages of cognition, affect, and conation. Every stimulus, whether external or internal, leads to an emotion and the emotion must be expressed in activity to

[4] See James, *Psychology*, Chap. XXVI, and Tansley, *The New Psychology*, Chaps. IX, X and XV.

complete the process. If arrested at any stage, the result may be disastrous. If stopped at the stage of cognition, it may cause a repression, and if stopped at the affect stage, it may cause regression. In either case there will be instinct energy to be expended through channels which are unnatural. There is a great danger to the progress of society lurking in the tendency to arrest the psychological circuit at the affect stage. As shown by McDougall,[5] the emotions are useful in directing the instinct energy into suitable action. For example, in the presence of peril, the emotion of fear leads the instinct of flight into active operation; or if flight is obstructed, the emotion of anger may guide the instinct of pugnacity into suitable expression. If the activity does not follow the emotion, serious consequences may result, and the annals of war-time neuroses are full of examples of repressions and regressions which followed violent emotional experiences that it was impossible to carry through the third stage of performance. There seems to be in civilized life to-day a drift toward satisfying the emotions rather than the instincts. We use the instincts as means of giving pleasurable exercise to the emotions instead of using the emotions to guide us to the proper satisfaction of the instincts.

[5] McDougall, *Social Psychology*, Chap. III.

Our newspapers are filled with "human-interest" stories which stimulate and excite the emotions of sympathy or of disgust in which we revel without expressing them in their related activities. Our social life is organized to give play to the emotions beyond the possibility of co-ordinated activity from their cognate instincts. We have professionalized sport that arouses the feeling of antagonism without its expression in personal combat. We are surfeited with sex stimuli on the stage and in current literature that awaken emotions which in most cases are left unexpressed either actually or in sublimation. This is very dangerous. It is not only bad ethics; it is bad psychology. It is following the pleasure principle of the unconscious instead of bringing life into line with the reality principle of the consciousness. As demonstrated above, life that is directed by the unconscious is abnormal. This abnormality may take the form of a serious neurosis, for the psychic energy which accompanies the impulse and which is felt in the emotion, if not expressed in normal activity, becomes dammed up and ultimately spills over in activity which is disintegrating in its results. The way of progress is by carrying every psychological process through the three stages of cognition, affect, and conation. The avenue of develop-

ment is to follow the stimulus and the emotion with the activity that is natural, or, when such activity is contrary to the ego ideal, in sublimated form under the direction of the reality principle. The unconscious impulses must be expressed, and their expression must be in conformity with the demands of the conscious ideals if mental health is to be maintained.

B. Temptation Is the Religious Word for the Unconscious Impulse Directed Toward Evil

It is wrong to assume that the unconscious is by nature evil, the cesspool of depraved desires, a pit of abominations. It is wrong to imagine that every impulse from the unconscious is a suggestion for the ego to submit to motives lower than the ego ideal and to yield to activity that would circumvent the realization of the life purpose. On the contrary, the unconscious, while it is the reservoir of the repressions, is also the source of our finest emotions, and the seat of the psychic energy that translates them into noble deeds. In its highest development the unconscious co-operates with the conscious to fulfill the life purpose and to satisfy the reality principle. It is also wrong, however, to suppose that everything in the unconscious is good and that its

impulses are to be followed if the life purpose is to be realized. Repressions are palpable handicaps to the integration of personality, they themselves being the evidences of disintegration. But there is much more in the unconscious, in addition to the repressions, that hinders the accomplishment in reality of our ideals and hopes. The acquisitive instinct, for example, unless its impulses are expressed in activity that satisfies the demands of the ego ideal, may lead us into all manner of evil, from sharp practice to open thieving. The quest for power may find realization through diligent efforts in self-development or by means of treading on the rights of others. The sex instinct, unless used in natural or in sublimated form to fulfill the life purpose, may result in gross libertinism.

It is these impulses which arise from the unconscious and which are contrary to the reality principle of the consciousness that, in religious terminology, are classified as temptations. They may be aroused by a stimulus from without reaching the unconscious through the medium of the senses, or from within, by a stimulus set up by the unconscious itself. They are inner urges toward activity which is antagonistic to the ego ideal and that would frustrate the accomplishment of the life purpose.

Temptation Is Not Sin. Temptation is not in itself sin. If a temptation is an unconscious impulse, albeit an impulse to do evil, and if an unconscious impulse is natural and an essential phase of our psychical constitution, then temptation is also natural, and an essential phase of our spiritual make-up. The perfectly integrated personality can feel an unconscious impulse for either good or evil. He may feel an inner urge toward activity which is entirely in keeping with his life purpose or he may feel impelled to behave in a manner, contrary to his ego ideal, that would bring disintegration. Yet he can maintain his integration by expressing the impulse in sublimated activity. Likewise the perfect person can be tempted, and yet not commit sin. Christ is the only example we have of the perfectly integrated personality and of perfect holiness. Much of his activity must have been the result of unconscious impulses. The giving of life to the widow of Nain's son was surely an act of impulse. But he never submitted to an unconscious impulse to do evil. He was "tempted like as we are, yet without sin."[6] He was not tempted to do the same things, but he was tempted in like manner. Being what he was, there were temptations, common to the average man, which never

[6] Heb. 4. 15.

assailed him. A man of noble character and cultural refinement is not tempted by base passions and mean motives which daily present themselves to many a soul who, because of the fate of circumstance, has known only the seamy side of life. So also, because of his supreme moral goodness, Jesus was not tempted by the same impulses which are the common lot of the average man; impulses that vary from the indulgence of his animal appetites, to the more subtle but more dangerous temptings of avarice, pride, hardness of heart, and self-sufficiency. Yet Christ was tempted in like manner. That is to say, there was presented to his consciousness a choice between motives, both high, but one satisfying the demands of the multitude and one satisfying the demands of his own conscience. He came to fulfill the law and the prophets. But there were conflicting prophecies of the Messiah. One proclaimed the Son of man, the chosen of God, who was to establish a Kingdom of Righteousness upon earth, with Jerusalem as its capital and the Jews as its ruling race. This was the hope in the hearts of the people. Jesus saw that if he assumed such a position and sought such leadership, he would have the intellectual force and the political power of the church to support him, and the mass of the

people would pass through fire and water to insure success to such a project. But there was a higher call to answer, a nobler prophecy to be fulfilled. It was the call of his own conscience to undertake the rôle of the suffering servant of God; by the travail of his soul to attain the realization of his life purpose, and by his knowledge of the goodness and love of God to justify many. A political upheaval and the establishment of a Kingdom of Justice would have been a godsend to the people of Christ's day. But this larger call to reveal the heart of God was a greater blessing, intended to bring salvation to all men. To this end was he sent. To have submitted to the lower ideal, high though it was, would have been for Christ to sin. He chose the higher. He was "tempted like as we are, yet without sin."

Temptation is not sin. This statement needs some further explanation. To think of evil is not to have evil thoughts. Jesus was conscious of all of the sin in the race, yet it gave him only grief and led him to the cross. To think of evil, however, in order, in any degree, to attain some feeling of satisfaction, is to have evil thoughts. So it is with temptation. Of itself it is not sin, but to harbor it, to gloat over it, to hold it fast for the feeling of gratification it gives, is to sin. It is arresting the

threefold psychological process at the affect stage. It is denying the ego ideal its place as the guide to behavior. It is defiling the inner man. Further than that, it must ultimately resolve itself into actual sin. The defaulting cashier does not commit the theft with his first impulse. The first suggestion is of how pleasant it would be to have a certain amount of money to pay off debts or to enjoy the luxury his heart craves. Then comes the impulse to appropriate to himself some of that which he handles. He rejects the thought. It presents itself again. He plays with it. He encourages it. Finally he submits to it. Translated into the words of psychology, the unconscious impulse to evil, when not dealt with promptly and properly and its energy utilized, becomes an obsessional impulse. The normal suggestion becomes an abnormal imperative. The thought becomes a sin. It results in psychic evil and ethical wickedness. "There is hardly an unconscious complex," says Jung, "which has not at some time existed as a phantasy in consciousness."[7]

Every Temptation Is Under the Control of the Conscious Mind. The powers of the conscious mind determine the ultimate fate of every unconscious impulse. Every unconscious impulse

[7] Jung, *Psychology of the Unconscious*, p. 270. Note 15.

is a suggestion that the ego adopt a certain mode of action, but it is in the light of consciousness that the suggestion is accepted, rejected, or sublimated. Jung in several places refers to the unconscious as man's "shadow."[8] He is right. Man's unconscious is, in some measure, analogous to his shadow. It is with him always, is present without his conscious aid, and seems rather unreal. Yet it is, in some degree, a record of its owner. However, if we were to examine only a man's unconscious, we would get but the barest outline of the darkest side of his life. It is in the full light of consciousness that we know a man at his best, and it is how he stands to the light that determines his shadow. So it is what man does with the impulse that arises from his unconscious that truly determines his character. A temptation is such an impulse when the fulfillment of it in thought or activity would be inconsistent with the ego ideal. It is, however, only a suggestion whose destiny is determined by the consciousness. It may be rejected completely; it may be granted full expression in conscious activity; or the accompanying psychic energy may be used for the attainment of higher ends.

When a temptation presents itself to the consciousness, it must not be thrust away.

[8] For example, *Psychological Types*, p. 203.

An earlier theology taught that every thought of evil must be suppressed, every impulse to wickedness subdued and put forever out of the mind. We now know that the setting of the forces of our minds against the temptation may itself be a handicap in dealing with it. Everyone knows how difficult it is at certain times to hit a golf ball with the proper stroke in the proper direction because of overambition. Certain difficulties in golf are called psychological or mental hazards, because they induce the player to become overanxious to do a certain thing. So it is with temptation. If we let our minds dwell upon a temptation in morbid apprehension, it becomes the more difficult to overcome. We also know that temptations cannot be forcefully thrust from the mind. They can be driven out of the consciousness, but they continue to affect the life from the unconscious. They are still active in the mind. To suppress a temptation is to repress it. From the darkness of the unconscious it surreptitiously guides the life to satisfy its own desires and to gain its own ends. Instead of becoming, through sublimation, an ally to help win the goal of life, it becomes a deadly enemy, a traitor within the camp, looking for its own gratification at the expense of the soul that gives it life.

Nor can a temptation be successfully dealt with by giving it full and free expression, feeling that done once, it is done for all time, and will never return with its insidious suggestion to evil. On the contrary, as suggested by Tennant, our "appetites grow by what they feed on."[9] By doing that which is evil we come to prefer evil, and to want more of it. By submitting to a temptation once we make such submission easier at the next attack. It is the matter of habit formation. Each separate act leaves a nerve path over which the next like impulse can travel with greater ease, until finally what was done at first only after great conflict is done habitually and without strain. The temptation first submitted to, in order to gain freedom from its impelling urge, comes ultimately to be a guiding motive of the life. With such activity the reality principle of the consciousness loses all power in the direction of the ego toward the realization of the ego ideal. The person becomes morally diseased and finds it impossible not to sin. This means disintegration of personality and prodigal wastage of psychic energy. It means disintegration, for, as pointed out in Chapter III, integration can come only by raising the ego

[9] Tennant, *The Concept of Sin*, p. 207. Reprinted by permission of The Macmillan Company, publishers, New York.

to the ego ideal. Free submission to temptations, which are unconscious impulses contrary to the reality principle, forbids the attainment of the ego ideal and thus makes for disintegration. It means dissipation of psychic energy, for any expenditure of energy that does not bring in return some development of character, some further integration of personality, is wasted energy.

The only effective way to deal with a temptation is to recognize it for what it is and to redirect its energy toward higher ends.

A temptation is an effort of the unconscious to guide the life into activity that will give expression to unconscious desires, but which activity would be antagonistic to the moral ideals of the consciousness. This longing for satisfaction must be granted by the consciousness if conflict is to be precluded. But, as we have already seen, the temptation granted free exercise in activity which is antagonistic to the ego ideal brings disaster. The solution lies in sublimation. The unconscious impulse represented in the temptation gets satisfaction, but so also does the reality principle. The impulse is transformed in the light of consciousness into a form which is compatible with the ego ideal and its energy is used in activity that aids the integration of personality. If the cashier de-

siring greater income changes the impulse to defraud and uses his energy, not to concoct ingenious schemes of book balancing, but to increase his own efficiency, he satisfies his ego ideal and, by sublimation, his unconscious impulse. Finally he realizes his desire when, with his greater capabilities and larger capacity for usefulness, the increased income is his. He has what he originally wanted and is able to satisfy still higher aspirations. This transformation of the temptation into sublimated activity must not be made by generating a new conflict. One desire must not be rejected and another substituted by the mere force of will. It must come by developing a natural interest in the sublimated form of the unconscious impulse. The old is forgotten in the love for the new. There is experienced "the expulsive power of a new affection." It is the apostle's dictum now verified by psychology. "Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good."[10]

[10] Rom. 12. 21.

CHAPTER VII

THE CONSCIENCE AND AMBIVALENCE
(The Recognition of Sin)

When the unconscious impulse for evil presents itself to the conscious mind seeking expression, there are several possible modes of response open to the consciousness. The impulse may be forced back into the unconscious or repressed. It may be given free and unguided expression, which will lead certainly to moral, if not to mental, disease. Or it may be expressed in activity that satisfies the impulse and which at the same time aids in the integration of personality. The power and the standards of the conscience determine the nature and the efficacy of the response made. A strong conscience without wisdom may repress the impulse. A weak conscience may be impotent before its urge. A wise and healthy conscience will direct the expression of the impulse in sublimated activity leading toward the consummation of the life purpose.

There is a phenomenon observed by the psychoanalysts which bears a marked resemblance in activity to the conscience. It is the

simultaneous emergence of antagonistic emotions into the field of consciousness, and is known as ambivalence. Because of this resemblance between ambivalence and the conscience, it becomes advisable to consider these two psychic activities together.

A. Ambivalence

Its Definition. Ambivalence is not to be confused with the dissociated or multiple personality spoken of by McDougall, which was the special study of the late Morton Prince and in the understanding and therapy of which he has made such a unique contribution to modern psychology. Dissociated personality is the evidence of seemingly different monads or units within the individual each attempting to guide the ego, "each leading its own mental life and struggling, in real conflicts of will, against its fellows for the use and control of the common organism."[1] It is as if there were several souls inhabiting the same body, each with a distinct personality, and each seeking to establish itself on the throne of the life. Generally, there is one which is the real self and which, after the battle of the souls, in which the pretenders are defeated, takes its place as the rightful monarch. In many cases, however, this contest is never

[1] McDougall, *Outline of Abnormal Psychology*, p. 523.

definitely decided and generally it is only after intense and prolonged struggle that one personality emerges triumphant. The standard illustration of the nature and progress of this conflict is the case of Miss Beauchamp, the history of which was written and published by Dr. Morton Prince.[2] Miss Beauchamp was unable to lead a normal life because of the presence of three other personalities each striving for the possession of her ego and each at times being able to suppress the others and to dominate her thoughts and actions. After a long and somewhat discouraging treatment, during which the unreal personalities were dropped by the way, the true Miss Beauchamp emerged and entered into complete control of the life. This was not a case of ambivalence, but of multiple personality. Multiple personality is the existence of several apparently distinct personalities within the ego, severally independent of one another, each in turn directing the life. Ambivalence, on the contrary, is the entrance into psychic activity of two opposing impulses at the same time, each antagonistic to the other, and neither being able of itself to direct the activity of the life.

Adler has described a condition which also might be mistaken for ambivalence, and for

[2] Prince, *The Dissociation of the Personality*, 1906.

that reason demands our consideration. He calls it psychological hermaphrodism. It is the appearance in all of us of some of the traits of the opposite sex. Every boy and man has, in some degree, the traits that are the natural characteristics of women and girls. Every woman and girl has, to some extent, the aggressive characteristics of boys and men. In those who are neurotically inclined, these sets of characteristics are more pronounced and seem to be in constant clash, each group seeking expression of itself in the life. This too must be kept from confusion with ambivalence. Psychological hermaphrodism is the existence within the self of opposite tendencies which are not necessarily opposing. They may stand one over against another without being antagonistic. They may, in fact, be mutually supporting in the normal person. A man without some of the tender qualities which are found more highly developed in women is less of a man than he would be with a measure of those qualities. A woman without some of the stern attributes of the opposite sex has not risen to the heights of her womanhood. Ambivalent tendencies, however, are always hostile one to the other. One must be done away that the other may live. While often, in psychological hermaphrodism, the opposite tendencies may oppose

each other, the conflict can always be resolved and both tendencies allowed to continue active, by means of a redirection of their exercise in ways that will aid integration. Since ambivalence is the entrance of both a positive and a negative feeling into consciousness at the same time, its conflict continues until one of the antagonists is put out of the competition. Integration can come only with freedom from ambivalence.

Ambivalence, called ambitendency by Jung,[3] is described by Freud as the direction of antithetical feelings toward the same person or object.[4] These feelings are not only contrasting but conflicting, such as love and hate, disgust and attraction, or a desire to help companied with a desire to hurt. Generally, one feeling has the aid of the unconscious urging its expression and the other has the support of the ego ideal pressing for its acceptance. The ego, in a normal person, decides which to follow, and the decision is largely determined by the comparative strength of the emotions of the unconscious and the life purpose of the consciousness.

---

[3] Jung, *Psychology of the Unconscious*, p. 107; *Psychological Types*, pp. 525, 539.

[4] Freud, *Introductory Lectures In Psychoanalysis*, p. 357; *Totem and Taboo*, pp. 49 and 50.

Its Origin, Action, and Release. Saint Paul, in the description of his own psychical life, provides us with an excellent example of the manner in which ambivalence gets its rise, the power it exerts in the life, and the manner in which it can be overcome. Ambivalence must have been a great handicap to Paul. He had a strong conscience impelling him toward the accomplishment of his life purpose. He also was a man of strong sentiments and to a great extent his life was directed by intense feelings. He was violently antagonistic to or a bold protagonist of whatever aroused his emotions. It was hard for him to kick against the pricks of his conscience, and it was difficult for him to guide the expression of his feelings. "For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do,"[5] is his own confession.

Freud gives us a lucid account of the manner in which ambivalence originates.[6] A strong impulse to behave in a certain way is suddenly conceived to be wrong due to a prohibition imposed by someone whose authority we respect and honor, such as a dear friend, loving parents, or our own particular social group, and which we accept as binding upon ourselves. The prohi-

[5] Rom. 7. 19.

[6] Freud, *Totem and Taboo*, pp. 49 and 50; *Collected Papers*, vol. ii, p. 320.

bition may also be the result of the individual's acceptance of a higher ego ideal. In either case both the prohibition and the impulse continue in power. The impulse continues to seek its expression and the prohibition forces the conformity of the impulse to the new ego ideal. Ambivalent behavior results. The individual continues to want to act in the manner urged by his unconscious impulse, for he sees in it a high pleasure and satisfaction, but he must not carry it out and may even abominate such action because of the prohibition.

If we read the story of Paul's conversion and his subsequent life in the light of the psychoanalysts' discovery of the nature and action of ambivalence, we shall understand him better and shall recognize the relation that exists between ambivalence and the conscience. Paul's religious life had been built upon the concept of a righteous Jehovah whose law was immutable and whose wrath would go forth upon all the wicked and such as kept not his commandments. The Messiah for whom he hoped was to come in clouds of glory and with might and with power would establish his kingdom of justice. His own life was bound by the ironclad rules of the Torah and Talmud. These were the beliefs of the Pharisees, and Paul was a Pharisee of the Pharisees. It is little wonder

that he resented with all his soul and fought with all his power the new way of life that was being proclaimed by the theologically unlearned followers of the humble Jesus. Paul did not believe that the meek were to inherit the earth or that the humble would be exalted. The neighbor whom he was to love was the Jew, the chosen of God. He was willing to be persecuted for righteousness' sake, but he did not believe that the kingdom of God was to be a kingdom of heaven. And he had scriptural support for his contention that he that is hanged upon a tree is accursed of God. He saw that the new testament with God as promulgated by the Christians would undermine the covenant of Jehovah with the children of Israel. All that he believed to be true would be rejected and his high hopes for his people would be confounded. Paul's impulse to persecute these followers of the Nazarene, who, it seemed to him, were subverting the ancient faith, thus had the support of both his conscience and his emotions. He could carry on his program of oppression with singleness of heart, because in this stage of his life there was no ambivalence.

Gradually, however, Paul's ego ideal underwent a change. He came to realize that Christ had not come to destroy, but to fulfill

the law and the prophets; that the son of man of Daniel was not the suffering Servant of Isaiah and that the true Messiah was to be the Son of God, whose meekness and humility would be tokens of his love. He came to see that the new moons and Sabbaths were of none avail without a humble and a contrite heart. He read with new wisdom that "to love mercy and to walk humbly" stood in equal favor with God's command to "do justly." With this development of his ego ideal, his conscience more and more constrained him to abandon his persecutions. It became harder and harder for him to choose between the two opposing modes of action presented to his consciousness. He was drawn in two ways—to answer the call of impulse to more drastic tyrannies, and to respond to the new demands made by his higher self. There existed within him the state of ambivalence. His impulses, however, continued to sway his life because of the greater strength of the emotions that accompanied them, until, finally, with his experience on the Damascus Road, he cast aside forever his old man, and Christ became the Lord of his life.

Notwithstanding, the state of ambivalence was not resolved into quiescence. He continued to be drawn in two directions, as demonstrated by the confession quoted above. He

desired to follow his Lord but his emotions were too deep-seated to give up their place without a struggle, and continued to influence the life. However, the conditions that prevailed before the conversion were now reversed. It was no longer the demands of his higher self that caused the conflict, but the impulses which were contrary to those demands. With the development in the new life toward the new life purpose the demands of these impulses came to be less and less insistent. Their accompanying emotions were being transferred to new desires, and their psychic energy used to aid in the accomplishment of new ambitions, until at the end, Paul could say that he had fought a good fight and had kept the faith.

It will be seen that Paul's experience is an excellent example of Freud's explanation of the nature of ambivalence. His impulses to activity, quite in keeping with his beliefs as a Pharisee, were conceived to be wrong with the acceptance of Christ as the Master of his life. Both the new prohibition and the old impulses continued in power for a time, and ambivalent behavior resulted, until he became dead to his old self and alive only to the new. The impulses, now conforming to the standards of the new ego ideal, became endowed with the psychic energy and accompanied by the emo-

tions which formerly had attended his impulses to oppression.

This ambivalence of Paul's is common, though perhaps in less marked degree, to all normal persons. We are always feeling impulses out of our dead past that do not satisfy our present ideals; impulses to actions which might have been in keeping with the standards of childhood or of youth, but which are no longer compatible with our advancing moral concepts. When these impulses develop into tendencies beyond control or direction, the ambivalence is abnormal and a symptom of anxiety neurosis. In such cases the only cure is with the aid of a psychophysician. But for the lesser degree of ambivalence to which normal people are subject, the way out is the one pursued by Paul. The new ideals are adhered to so closely that the old impulses gradually die through lack of expression and their libido and emotions are transferred to the new impulses which arise with the new standards. Again, it is "the expulsive power of a new affection." When a man's impulses are in entire harmony with his ego ideal, there is no ambivalence.

B. The Definition of the Conscience

Perhaps there is no other theological concept which has been quite so universally denied by

the new psychologists as the Christian idea of conscience. As there has been a universality of denial so also there has been a unity of effort to explain this mental activity in terms of psychology that would rid it of its awesomeness and take away its power. There has, however, been no unanimity of explanation, and no definition offered has received general acceptance. But there have been several proposals which have received a larger share of acknowledgment and which we shall now examine, seeking to determine their worth.

Conscience Is Not Merely Herd Disapproval. The most popular explanation of the nature of conscience is to be found in the suggestion that it is the law of the herd in action, the pressure of society or of one's own group. This description has been set forth by Freud, Trotter, and McDougall.

Trotter shows the difference in attitude toward wrongdoing in the gregarious and the solitary animal.[7] The dog or the cat when caught in an offense both recognize that punishment will be meted out. But the dog knows that he has done wrong and will come to be punished, while the cat's sole impulse is to

[7] Trotter, *Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War*, pp. 40 and 41. Reprinted by permission of The Macmillan Company, publishers, New York.

escape. It is because the dog is a gregarious animal while the cat is solitary in its habits. The dog instinctively hears and obeys the will of the pack. He acts in unity with the others for the good of all. He becomes accustomed to the voice of authority of his group. Consequently, when he performs an act which he has been taught is a wrong action, and is to be followed by punishment, his instinctive submission to authority leads him to yield to his chastisement in the attitude that it is his just recompense. The cat, being a solitary animal, knows no law but its own needs. Punishment may be inflicted, but shame is never infused, for the solitary animal's law of action is its own law. It has no obligation to meet save its own requirements. This, says Trotter, shows where the conscience develops. It is a by-product of the gregarious instinct. It is essential that the herd act in unity for the sake of its own protection and the continuity of its existence. Any breach of that unity is recognized as a breach against that which is good for the herd and a sense of sin results. This is quite true, and explains the effect of the group conscience on the individual and the way in which the individual conscience is educated to the group ideal. It does not, however, explain why, in the case of humans, an

individual's conscience may condemn him for actions which, according to the group conscience, are right actions. An individual's conscience may lead him to activity far above the demands of his herd. It is only thus that social progress in morality is accomplished. Those who have consciences that keep their behavior on a high moral plane help to lift the other members of the group toward that higher level. "Each member of the flock tending to follow its neighbor," says Trotter, as already quoted, but he adds "and in turn to be followed." The social or group pressure resulting from a social or group conscience is, then, the result of the influence of individual consciences acting in aggregate. Ultimately, herd approval or disapproval is regulated by the consciences of the individual members of the herd.

Freud says, "It has long been our contention that 'dread of society' is the essence of what is called conscience."[8] Certainly a consideration for the effect upon our social group of certain modes of action helps to regulate our behavior, but it is quite possible for the conscience to mold our conduct when "dread of society" has no influence. For example, the thief may have a conscience which forbids murder, but permits him to steal. Society condemns him for his

[8] Freud, *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*, p. 10.

breach of the social standard. It punishes him because he has done wrong to the group. He continues to steal in spite of this pressure of society, but he will not commit murder because of his own conscience. On this matter Professor J. A. Hadfield says, "Normally, the will can no more be moved by an ideal alien to the character of the self, than a heat-spot on the skin will respond to an odor."[9] That is to say, the herd law of action has no effect on us until it is accepted by us as binding upon us. If herd law sways us, it exerts this influence only with our authority, for when our conscience and the herd law differ, we follow our conscience. Many a conscientious objector in the Great War suffered far more in his detention camp than he might have suffered in the army, because he followed the lead of his conscience rather than submit to the demands of the herd when those demands were antagonistic to his own standards.

McDougall contends that what has been called conscience is a moral ideal accompanied by a sentiment to make that ideal real. He says that the ideal and the sentiment are the result of herd suggestion reaching us through individuals whose personalities we honor, whose

[9] Hadfield, *Psychology and Morals* (3rd Edition, New York, 1926), p. 102.

opinions we respect, and whose lives we seek to emulate. "Both of these achievements," he says, "the acquisition of the ideal and of the sentiment for the ideal, are rendered possible only by the absorption of the more refined parts of the moral tradition, under the influence of some of the personalities in whom it is most strongly embodied. These persons . . . exert this influence upon us in virtue principally of the admiration that they invoke in us."[10] This is only in part true. Certainly, as I have attempted to show in Chapter III, we develop psychologically according to the manner in which we respond to objective reality, and we are swayed in one way or another by the qualities of those whom we esteem. Our characters are molded by the company we keep. As McDougall says, "These persons exert this influence upon us in virtue principally of the admiration that they invoke in us." But it is the "admiration that they invoke *in us*," which gives them their influence. It is because we see in them the embodiment of our ideals that we seek to emulate them. They are what we should like to be. Again, it is the working of the conscience of the individual. Others influence us only when we see in them the realization of our own ambitions. We do not

[10] McDougall, *Social Psychology*, p. 234.

emulate those whose standards are contrary to our own. Even Christ is not honored by those who do not hold his ideals. An objective ideal is essential and may be universal, but it has no effect upon our own lives until it is accepted as our ideal.

Herd influence, then, is not conscience. It may guide our conscience. It may whet our conscience. It may spur our conscience to action. But it is not our conscience. The conscience is distinctly a possession of the individual. Even the herd conscience is only the consciences of the members of the herd acting in aggregate. McDougall himself denies that the conscience is only herd law in action when he asserts that in the highest stage of moral development, behavior is "regulated by an ideal of conduct that enables a man to act in a way that seems to him right regardless of the praise or blame of his immediate social environment."[11]

Conscience Is Not Merely Based on Traditional Ideas of Right. There has been offered another explanation of the nature of conscience which is the same as the proposal just considered except that it is couched in different terms, and, for that reason, must be considered separately. It is said that the conscience is

[11] McDougall, *op cit.*, p. 186.

nothing more than conventional morality, the acceptance of traditional ideas of right and wrong. It is arrived at, as are the social conventions, out of customs and manners rather than through any reasoned concept of rightness and evil. Its power is exerted through the same channels of public opinion. For example, a man does not wear brown shoes at a fashionable wedding, not because black shoes are better, but because social convention forbids. The black shoes may be better, to be sure, but they are worn because they are part of the conventional dress. So also, it might be said, a man is true to one wife, not because such fidelity is ethically higher, but because it is the conventionally moral thing to do. It may be ethically higher, but the man is true, not for that reason, but because he wants to keep the conventions of his group. Jung lends his support to this definition. "Conscience," he says, "is based upon traditional 'right ideas,' and . . . therefore possesses that not-to-be-despised treasure of unlimited worldly wisdom which is employed by public opinion in much the same fashion as the judge uses the penal code."[12]

It is freely admitted that much of our morality is built upon this sort of tradition. Many of us "remember the Sabbath day to keep it

[12] Jung, *Psychological Types*, p. 213.

holy" because it is the custom of our group so to do. We carefully draw a dividing line between what can and what cannot be done to keep the day sacred, not so much because of a yearning after holiness as because of a fear of the reproach of those whose opinions we respect, and we take our place in the church because of family traditions instilled into us during our formative years. On the other hand, there are many who dishonor the Lord's Day and abuse the church because of participation in the opposite traditions. There has also developed a new conventionality in recent years among certain people. These people are bound just as securely by the customs of their group, even though the conventional thing with them is to be unconventional. They strive with great earnestness to do that which is informal in order to conform to the formalities of their associates. They too are followers of tradition.

These observations, however, do not explain the conscience. The conscience directs the life in conformity with the ego ideal, whether the resulting activity follows traditional ideas of right or stands in opposition to them. A man may honor the Lord's Day or take his place in the church because his conscience directs him to "worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness," even in the face of the sarcastic rebuffs of his

fellows who call him a sentimentalist. Or a young person may conform to conventional morality because of the dictates of his conscience in direct opposition to the conventional unconventionality of his group.

The objection to this suggestion is the same as that presented in the previous section. The conscience is an attribute of the individual and operates in the life of the individual even in antagonism to the traditional ideas of the group. Jung himself presents this objection to his own position when he declares that the collective traditional attitude to life may stifle a man's highest values until finally the ideal within him will rise in objection, and even at the risk of his life he will tell the world that it is in error and wherein it errs.[13]

Conscience Is Not Repressed Ideas for Good. There has been another suggestion made regarding the character of the conscience, which seems to confuse conscience and temptation with ambivalence. Hadfield proposes that "so far as their purely psychological mechanisms are concerned temptation and conscience are identical, for both are the voice of suppressed desires. Temptation is the voice of the suppressed evil; conscience is the voice of the suppressed good. . . . The 'good' man is a man who possesses

[13] Jung, *Psychological Types*, p. 229.

sentiments such as kindliness, justice and generosity; he suppresses cruelty, avarice, and injustice, but these suppressed desires crave for expression and therefore, in so far as he is good, these desires 'tempt him to evil.' On the other hand, the bad man is a man who has accepted as his sentiments selfishness, meanness, and vice, and suppresses all that is commonly regarded as good. In him the suppressed good craves for expression—and so the voice of conscience is heard urging him to be compassionate, courageous, and generous."[14]

This explanation is not tenable. The impulses arising out of repressions are obsessional impulses which force expression of themselves. There is no choice. The libido of the repressed desire must find egress which it accomplishes by means of the obsessional impulse. Therefore impulses to cruelty, avarice, and injustice coming out of the repressions of these ideas cannot be called temptations. They do not tempt; they command. A temptation is the presentation of an alluring suggestion to the consciousness that the ego act in a manner contrary to the ego ideal, in order that pleasure or satisfaction may be won. Likewise, impulses to goodness coming out of repressed ideas for good cannot be called the conscience; first,

[14] Hadfield, *Psychology and Morals*, pp. 48 and 49.

because such impulses would be obsessional impulses; but, more than that, the conscience is not an impulse. The conscience is that which accepts or rejects an impulse. It is an activity of the conscious mind, not a wish from the unconscious.

The Conscience Is the Ego Ideal in Action. If we can conceive of the ego ideal being clothed with the power of the will to fashion the life into its own likeness, we shall have a quite clear concept of the nature of the conscience. It is the will observing, criticizing, and guiding the life according to the standards of the idealized life purpose. The will without the standards of the ego ideal is not the conscience, nor is the ego ideal without the power of the will. Conscience is the ego ideal in action using the power of the will to bring the real self into conformity with the ideal self.[15]

The conscience is not a functioning phase of the mind either when the will and the ego ideal do not operate in harmony, or when the ideal is low enough to be easily realized by the ego.

It is entirely possible to have an ideal of

---

[15] In order to obviate the possibility of the confusion of these terms as here used with the teachings of faculty psychology, I might define conscience as the conscious mind examining the life in the light of the goal it has set up for itself, and its direction of the life toward the realization of that goal.

absolute perfection but to do nothing about it. Some people live in two spheres, as it were, one the ideal and the other the real. In the ideal sphere they have a concept of what they would like to be, but they make no effort to bring the real self into coincidence with the ideal. The result is that the ego ideal becomes a phantasy with no influence in directing the real self. It is said of many that they are religious, but that they do not allow their religion to interfere with their business or their pleasure. On Sunday they live according to their ideal, but during the week they live according to their will. The contact is broken. The ego ideal and the will do not function together. The conscience is dead.

Nor is the conscience a functioning phase of the mind when the ego ideal is low enough to be easily realized. The conscience is entirely dependent for what stimulates its activity and the force of such activity upon the height of the ethical standard one has set up for his goal of life. When the ethical standard is no higher than the satisfaction of the unconscious impulses the will and the ego ideal may work in perfect harmony, but the conscience is not active, for there is no objecting, criticizing or directing to be done. At the other extreme is the perfectly good man, whose ego has been raised to

his ego ideal. In his life the conscience functions perfectly. Every impulse is given expression by the will in activity which satisfies the demands of the ideal. Christ had a conscience, but he was never conscience-stricken, for every impulse was expressed according to his life purpose. His ego ideal and his will worked in perfect harmony to satisfy the demands of perfection.

C. The Origin and Activity of the Conscience

Its Origin. It has been suggested that the conscience is generated by traditional ideas of right supported by the weight of herd influence or social pressure. This merely sets the problem further back. McDougall and Tansley assert that ethical idealism exists in everyone, and it is this ethical idealism that makes the conscience to function. It is developed and progresses in us through our contacts with others, but where did it come from originally? It is in us in the collective unconscious and is made active through herd suggestibility, but how did it come into activity in the first place? There must have been a time when some individual, or several individuals, had a higher ideal of activity than the other members of the herd. Through herd suggestibility this ideal

came to be the ideal of the group. How did these ideals arise in these particular individuals?

There are two possibilities. It may be that experience taught that certain actions invariably brought pain, and for that reason these came to be considered as wrong actions. Certain other actions brought pleasure or satisfaction, and these came to be considered as right actions. Some animals, especially herd animals, can be taught to refrain from certain actions by the judicious use of punishment and can be taught to perform certain other actions by the careful distribution of favors. If we conceive of the ideals and of the activity of conscience originating in this manner, it is a frank admission that all life is hedonistic. McDougall and Freud, however, assert that psychically man is not hedonistic, but is purposive, always striving toward goals.

We are thus led to the other alternative—that man has, and always has had, a concept of what he ought to be. Since he has been a moral being, he has examined every impulse in the light of that concept. He has not always lived up to his ideal, but his will has examined his life in the light of that ideal and commended or condemned his life according as it succeeded or failed to realize this higher

concept. It is only thus that we can account for man's conscience judging his thoughts as well as his acts. Man's conscience, then, is inherent, a part of his psychic equipment.

Its Activity. The conscience is active only when there is an ideal higher than the impulses coming out of the unconscious. It sees a goal toward which the life should be directed and it seeks to guide the life toward the attainment of that goal. This is accomplished through resistances that translate those impulses which are contrary to the ego ideal into activity that will help to secure its realization. The conscience is like the pilot of a boat. The pilot of a ship directs its course from the bridge, where he has a clear view of what lies ahead, but his directions are transmitted to the rudder under water at the stern of the boat, and by resistance to pressure, the ship is guided toward its destination. The conscience is located in the consciousness, where it can see the direction in which our bark is moving, but its guiding power is by means of a series of inner resistances which direct the life toward its goal. It must be noted that the pressure is not opposed by the conscience, but is used. If the conscience were to set up an opposition which would completely resist the pressure of the unconscious impulses, we could not move toward

our ego ideal. It is by using the pressure that we journey toward the harbor of our hopes.

It should be remarked again, that it is only when there is co-ordination between the ego ideal and the will, that the conscience functions. The pilot's orders must be properly translated into rudder control before the ship can be directed.

The ego ideal which calls the conscience into activity is a developing ideal. The goal which we set out to attain is a progressive goal. As we approach its realization, it moves on, ever calling us to still nobler life standards. This development is effected through the influence of those whose characters we admire. They influence us because their characters are the realization of our ideals. As we approach toward a like realization in our own lives and and in so doing acquire still higher standards, we turn to others for our inspiration whose lives exemplify these worthier concepts. The final stage in this progression is to "have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus." When this ego ideal of perfection functions in harmony with the will, directing the life toward its accomplishment, we may say that the individual possessing it has a truly Christian conscience.

D. The Distinction Between Ambivalence and the Conscience

It is easy to distinguish between ambivalence and the conscience. Ambivalence results when a strong impulse to behave in a certain way is suddenly conceived to be wrong because of a prohibition set up in the consciousness. Ambivalence continues until the impulse is given sublimated expression in keeping with the prohibition. It is the conscience which designates and enforces that prohibition. The conscience, recognizing that the ego is wandering from the course that leads to the accomplishment of the ego ideal, applies pressure in the form of prohibitions, which pressure will turn the life back into the path that leads toward its goal. During the application of this pressure ambivalent behavior may result. But when the life is again on its course and all its impulses are expressed in activity that will carry it toward the realization of its life purpose, the conscience will be quiet and ambivalence will be done away.

Ambivalence results from a determined effort of the unconscious to affect the life and thus to gain satisfaction for itself according to the demands of the pleasure principle which regulates its activity. Since control of the life by

the unconscious is abnormal, then ambivalence is, to the extent that it influences the activity of the life, an evidence of some degree of abnormality. The conscience, on the other hand, can function only in normal persons. The conscience is the mental activity resulting from co-ordination between the ego ideal set up by the consciousness and the will, an exercise of the conscious mind. Freud says, "that as long as the system consciousness controls activity and motility, the mental condition of the person in question may be called normal."[16] If the conscience is an activity of the conscious mind, and if conscious direction of the life is the evidence of mental health, then the functioning of the conscience is an evidence of normality. The difference is that ambivalence is the expression of the unconscious in the life, and to the degree of its power, an evidence of abnormality, while the activity of the conscience is the proof of the conscious direction of the life, and for that reason an evidence of mental health.

[16] Freud, *Collected Papers*, vol. iv, p. 111.

CHAPTER VIII

THE SENSE OF GUILT AND THE INFERIORITY COMPLEX

(The Conviction of Sin)

An emotion is the feeling stage in the three-phase psychological process of cognition, affect, and conation. The emotion is aroused by the response of the ego to a stimulus or by the rise of an impulse from the unconscious. It guides the will toward activity that will give expression to the impulse and satisfaction to the emotion. The conscience has need of such an agency to translate the demands of the ego ideal into action of the will. When the conscience, acting in its capacity as observer, commends the ego for behavior which has been in conformity with the ego ideal, the resulting emotion is a feeling of gratification. This emotion will guide the will to activity of the same sort when a similar occasion arises. When the conscience condemns the ego for failing to act in accordance with the standards of the ego ideal, the resulting emotion is the sense of guilt. This emotion will cause a resistance to be set up against the repetition of such activity and

thus is an aid to the conscience in directing the life toward the realization of the life purpose.

It has been suggested that this sense of guilt is merely the sense of inferiority issuing out of a thwarted quest for power. It is considered to be an incipient inferiority complex and unless met and coped with successfully may result in serious psychical harm. It is proposed that, in order to forestall this possibility, we should give our ego positive expression which will satisfy our yearning after superiority. The sentiments known as the Christian virtues of meekness, humility, long-suffering, gentleness, compassion, and so forth, are to be replaced by the more positive sentiments of self-assertion, confidence, boldness, and courage. If we would be mentally healthful, we are advised to be forceful. The sense of guilt is conceived to be one of the negative sentiments of which we must rid ourselves if we would attain to full self-realization. In its place we must have self-confidence and assurance.

It is the purpose of this chapter to demonstrate that the sense of guilt is not due to an abnormal sense of inferiority, that it leads to larger integration of personality, and that it must continue active until lost in the experience of forgiveness. In order to accomplish

this, it becomes necessary to examine the nature of the inferiority complex and of the sense of guilt.

A. Inferiority Complex

Alfred Adler was an earnest disciple of Freud, but, unlike most of his comrades, he protested against the dogmatic teaching of the group leader. His main objection was to Freud's strict adherence to the theory that sex is the master motive of all life and his refusal to follow any discovery except in so far as it might support this theory. Adler's opposition led to much bitterness and finally ended in his complete rupture with Freud. After this break, Adler followed the course of investigation which ultimately led him to the establishment of a new school of psychoanalysis. This he has called the School of Individual Psychology.

Among other things Adler had observed that the psychological phenomena known as Sadism and Masochism[1] were active in other phases of mental life besides the sexual. He saw men seeking power over those whom they neither loved nor hated. On the other hand, he noted some who were obedient and sub-

[1] Sadism is the urge to dominate and to hurt the person loved. Masochism is the desire to be dominated and the willingness to be brutally treated by the person loved.

missive, not because of the superior right or ability of others to control, nor because of any specific feelings directed toward them, but because of some inner demands of their own souls. Further study and experiment led him to conclude that these opposite expressions resulted from the same kind of impelling force. His continued examination and classification of psychic activity seemed to confirm his theory that this impelling force was behind every impulse, thought, or act of the individual. This, he says, is an inherent quest for power, common to all. "A thoroughgoing study has taught us," he writes, "that we can best understand the manifold and diverse movements of the psyche as soon as our *most general presupposition*, that the psyche has as its objective the *goal of superiority*, is recognized. . . . Whether a person desires to be an artist, the first in his profession, or a tyrant in his home, to hold converse with God or humiliate other people; whether he regards his suffering as the most important thing in the world to which everyone must show obeisance; whether he is chasing after unattainable ideals or old deities, overstepping old limits and norms, at every part of his way, he is guided and spurred on by his longing for superiority, the thought of his godlikeness, the belief in his special magical power.

. . . In order to gain control over an object or over a person, he is capable of proceeding along a straight line, bravely, proudly, overbearing, obstinate, cruel; or he may, on the other hand, prefer, forced by experience, to resort to by-paths or circuitous routes, to gain his victory by obedience, submission, mildness, and modesty."[2] This activity is not recognized nor controlled by the consciousness, but is due to an obsessional demand for power, operating from the unconscious. Whichever road it takes, whether positive domination or negative submission, the choice is made because it appears to offer the shortest route to the goal of superiority.

McDougall conceives of a similar phenomenon, although he does not call it by the same name, nor does he give it the same eminent position as the sole guide to all the activity of the individual. He calls it the self-regarding sentiment. It makes itself evident in the life through either a positive self-feeling or a negative self-feeling. When it is normal, the self-regarding sentiment is an aid to integration, for it leads one to a recognition of his capabilities or his lack of them, and helps him to realize the true nature of his environment and his own relation to it. Under these conditions

[2] Adler, *Individual Psychology*, p. 7. (Italics are his.)

it might be called self-respect, for the individual is taking his rightful place in society, a place neither unduly high nor unjustly low, a position which satisfies the demands of his own soul and the requirements of his group. It is possible, however, for a person to be so filled with self-conceit that the only feeling he experiences is confidence or assurance, the positive self-feeling. Or he may be so abject as to know no feeling but meek submission. Either case is abnormal, and in extremes may develop a neurosis.[3]

Rivers also recognizes the power of a frustrated desire for superiority to cause psychic difficulty. He asserts that both paranoia and dementia praecox "often seem to start from a state of inferiority, real or supposed."[4] Freud acknowledges that anxiety neurosis may result from apprehensiveness in children. "Investigation of the conditions of real anxiety would logically lead to the view that the consciousness of personal weakness and helplessness—inferiority, as A. Adler calls it—when it is able to maintain itself into later life is the final cause of neurosis."[5] Jung also admits the potency of

[3] McDougall, *Social Psychology*, Chap. VII.

[4] Rivers, *Instinct and the Unconscious* (2d Edition, London, 1924), p. 144.

[5] Freud, *Introductory Lectures*, p. 339.

"the inferiority feeling—function, operating seductively and unconsciously,"[6] to undermine the ego ideal and bring disaster to the character. It is to Adler, however, that we are indebted for the greatest contributions on the nature of this phenomenon, and it is from him that we have learned most concerning its origin, activity, and cure.

The Origin and Activity of the Inferiority Complex. Generally, though not always, the inferiority complex has its beginnings in childhood. When a child is handicapped by some organic defect or has been arrogantly dominated by parents, teachers, or the members of his own little group, he develops a keen sense of his inferiority. At the same time there is hidden within his soul a yearning to rise to his highest possibilities, a deep-seated desire not to be left behind in the race of life. This feeling may spur the child to zealous efforts to overcome his handicap and thus to disprove the opinions of others concerning his weaknesses. If he has a physical deficiency, that very disadvantage may stimulate him to greater endeavors of physical prowess. The boy who cannot box, wrestle, or play football will strive to develop himself in one of the sports in which he can compete with other boys

[6] Jung, *Psychological Types*, p. 438.

notwithstanding his handicap. Or he may turn to some other field of endeavor, and may attain leadership in organization or in the classroom. Likewise the man who has been visited by a series of disasters, and the story of whose life is of recurrent failures, may seek to "rise on stepping-stones" of his dead self "to higher things." Thus, compensation for the feeling of inferiority may be acquired through achievement.

If the individual fails to mitigate his sense of inferiority by means of such compensation, several roads of disintegrating possibilities are opened. The feeling of inferiority may be repressed, after which the unconscious seeks to satisfy the quest for power by various obsessions. Or the feeling may be brooded over and dwelt upon and its significance enlarged, until a regression takes place, resulting in impotency, and the wastage of psychic energy. Under the control of a repression or a regression, the ego is led into activity which will bring satisfaction to the quest for power and will generate a feeling of superiority, but without any true relation to reality. The channels of activity which may be taken in the effort to gain satisfaction may be divided according as they are active or passive in expression.

If active expressions are resorted to, the

individual uses positive means to secure domination over others and to gratify his own wish for power. He may bully those over whom he has some authority, always taking care that he is never placed where he in turn may be bullied. He may seek to show his own superiority by finding fault with others, never seeing worth in anyone except as it may show confirmation of his own ideas. He may affect a superiority by always exaggerating his influential connections, the certainty of his knowledge, and the depth of his wisdom, seeing in the conclusions of others only attestations in support of his own judgments. He may complain of the circumstances which have prevented him from becoming what he might have been, using his real defect or his supposed inferiority as the excuse for his failure. Or he may use his deficiencies and weaknesses as sources of power, making others wait on him and submit to his domination because of his incapacities. Some one of these channels is followed by most of us at times in order to satisfy our will to power. What is evident in normal persons in slight degree is manifested in neurotics as the sole motive of their life. The neurotic who affects superiority may develop the hallucination that he is really an exalted personage. And the neurotic who uses his weaknesses to gain

power may unconsciously acquire new symptoms which will be an aid to that end.

The passive expressions likewise vary greatly in degree. Evident in all normal persons, they are conspicuous in the neurotic. They may be divided into two classes—phantasy-attainment and servility. Those who satisfy their quest for power through phantasy-attainment, spend their lives in daydreaming, planning adventures and drawing mental pictures of successes which are never sought after in reality. They waste their days and dissipate their psychic energy in devising means of profiting by the prosperity they will never have until they judiciously apply that energy in an effort to realize their hopes. On the other hand, there are those who seek to attain power by means of exaggerated meek submission. A servant is cringingly servile to his master, soothing his own quest for power with the thought that he is thus showing himself to be the best of servants. It is quite possible to be proud of one's humility. It was true of the last generation more than of ours, that many obeyed the laws and practiced the Christian virtues largely for the superior feeling coming with the "holier-than-thou" attitude. Our own generation is more given to slavish yielding to whatever the group dictates in order that we may be the best

of "hale fellows well met." In each case submission is practiced for the sake of the feeling of superiority it brings. With the neurotic this submission develops into abject servility and symptoms are acquired to help maintain the continuance of the condition.

The inferiority complex is thus seen to grow out of a real or supposed inferiority which is not compensated for through achievement. The unconscious, being given control of the life, refuses to recognize reality and gains satisfaction for the quest for power in the artificial world of phantasy or hallucination.

The Cure. The cure for the inferiority complex is a re-orientation to reality. The patient is led to a recognition of the origin of the complex in his deep-seated sense of inferiority. The physician may lead or point out the way, but the patient must see for himself the true origin of his difficulty. This is never easy, for it means that the patient must relinquish his fondest possession, the sense of his own superiority, for a calm recognition of his real inferiority where that exists, or of its fanciful nature when it is only supposed. In seeking to have his patient take this step the analyst may lose his case. The patient thinks he is being belittled, sets up a resistance against the analyst, and drops back into the shelter of his neurosis.

Even if this step can be taken, the patient is not cured until he is able to take his rightful place in society. He must recognize that, despite his handicap, he can still become a useful member of his group. He must acknowledge his weaknesses, but he must also know his capabilities. He must not yearn for that which is beyond him, but he must strive to rise to his possibilities. McDougall's concept of self-respect must be his goal, wherein he can enjoy both the positive self-feeling when he has achieved some success, and, on occasion, know humility in the feeling of negative self-regard.

Saint Paul, who was a practical psychologist, has given us several principles of behavior which should help to keep us from falling into the snare of the inferiority complex. He advises everyone "not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think."[7] And in another place he adds, "If a man thinketh himself to be something, when he is nothing, he deceiveth himself."[8] His standard for his own life may well be ours, for he was speaking not only of material things when he said, "I have learned, in whatsoever state I am, therein to be content. I know how to be abased, and I know also how to abound: in everything and

[7] Rom. 12. 3.
[8] Gal. 6. 3.

in all things have I learned the secret both to be filled and to be hungry, both to abound and to be in want."[9] Paul knew both the positive and the negative feelings of self-regard. And he had self-respect.

B. The Sense of Guilt

Its Definition. The sense of guilt is indeed Bunyan's "Slough of Despond," a mental bog which drags men down, taking their eyes away from the glorious hopes of the future and concentrating them upon the evil and remorse of the present. It can be overcome only with difficulty, but it must be crossed to reach the highway to larger life. It is also a turning point for some, like Pliable, back into sin, but for wayfaring men with a goal to gain, like Christian, it is a step in their advance. It may result in hopeless despair for those whose ego ideal is not an integral part of their life, but for men of firmly knit character it is a testing place that proves their capability of continuing on the journey toward their life goal.

The concept of sin in this study is objective; that is, sin is conceived to be a state or act contrary to an objective standard, a state or act which leads to a condition forbidding fellow-

[9] Phil. 4. 11 and 12.

ship with God, whether or not that state or act is considered to be sinful by the individual responsible for it. The sense of guilt, on the other hand, is purely subjective. It is related only to the individual's own ideal. A man may be guilty of sin according to our definition, but he may be free from the sense of sin according to his own standards. It is only when he fails to attain to the realization of his own ego ideal that he feels any responsibility or any condemnation. There are some misfortunes, handicaps, or disturbances which affect our lives, for which we have no feeling of responsibility and therefore no sense of guilt. There are other disturbances, however, which we conceive to be moral failures, not only in us, but of us, and for which our own consciences condemn us. It is this subjective experience of self-condemnation that is the sense of guilt. After the recognition of sin by the conscience, there comes the conviction of sin in the consciousness.

Its Origin and Activity. The sense of guilt arises out of the activity of the conscience. When the conscience has marked the failure of the ego to act according to the demands of the ego ideal, it censures the self and the individual experiences a feeling of self-reproach. This self-blame is the sense of guilt.

It is possible, however, for this same kind of feeling to be aroused when it is not the normal working of the conscience guiding the life toward the accomplishment of the ego ideal. This emotion can be awakened without any real relation between the actual self and the ego ideal. When so aroused, it is more a sense of painful inferiority than of sin. The emotion may be thus falsely enlivened by either of two causes—the influence of others or the hidden power of our own morbid imaginations. We are tremendously influenced in the ideas we have of ourselves by the attitudes which others display toward us. We are only too anxious to accept their evaluations when they pamper our pride and gratify our sense of superiority, but we also respond to their appraisal of our worth when it is low. All too frequently the bad boy becomes worse by being constantly reminded of his wickedness,[10] and the dullard becomes more dull by being repeatedly told that he is stupid. So, according to the degree of our sensitiveness, we may acquire a sense of guilt by hearing ourselves continually referred to as depraved sinners. There is a certain

[10] McDougall, *Social Psychology*, p. 191, suggests Kipling's story "Baa, Baa, Black Sheep" as an illustration. It is an excellent study of the manner in which this psychical development takes place.

type of religious leader who, either consciously or unconsciously, suggests that man is wholly vile and so plays upon the minds of his hearers that some come to believe that they are actually reprobate and may confess to sins which they never committed either in thought or in deed. This is a false sense of guilt. This same false emotion can also be called into activity by a morbid imagination. We know how the emotions which accompany the various instincts can be called into activity by consciously dwelling upon them. We can experience the sensations of hunger or of thirst by picturing in our mind's eye delicately prepared viands or refreshing drink. So also, we can conjure up vivid images of the blackness of our hearts and the infamy of our sins which will bring in their wake a deep sense of guilt. These emotions, in both instances, are false, because they are not truly related to the ego ideal. The sense of guilt is only real when the conscience, functioning in a normal manner, measures the ego with the ego ideal and finds the ego wanting.

This measurement takes place and may result in self-denunciation, even when the contrary act is performed unwittingly. "The sense of guilt," says Freud, "resulting from the violation of a Taboo (which in civilized life would be equivalent to the violation of an ethical

standard) is in no way diminished if the violation took place unwittingly. . . . Even in the Greek myth the guilt of Œdipus is not canceled by the fact that it was incurred without his knowledge and will and even against them."[11] The conscience may also measure the actions of an earlier stage of the ego in the light of a newly acquired ego ideal. After Kudlooktoo became a Christian and adopted the standard of Christ for his own life, his conscience condemned him for having shot Professor Marvin sixteen years before, and his sense of guilt led him to confess his wrong to the missionary. Our conscience judges our life not by our past weakness, but by our present strength. It does not show mercy because of the dimness of our past understanding, but it is exacting in the light of our present knowledge. Ignorance is not an acceptable plea before the bar of conscience. And the sense of guilt is the punishment meted out.

It has been suggested that the sense of guilt is merely a sense of herd disapproval growing out of an action that is recognized to be contrary to the law of the group. What was said in the last chapter regarding the origin of the conscience in the herd instinct, need only be repeated here for the sense of guilt. The explanation is quite satisfactory when the ideals of

[11] Freud, *Totem and Taboo*, Note, p. 115.

the individual are the same as the ideals of the group, but it will not hold for the great multitude of those whose standards are either higher or lower than the group standards. If our ideals are different from the accepted ideals, we can break a custom or a law of the group and recognize that breach, but have no sense of guilt. On the other hand, we can have a feeling of guilt when we have conformed to all the demands of the group, but have failed to live up to some higher standard of our own. It is the nature of our ego ideal which ultimately determines the vigor of our sense of guilt.

The sense of guilt has its origin in the conscience. It is therefore a characteristic of the individual and is an activity of his conscious mind. It is the emotion aroused by the conscience when the ego has failed to keep on its course toward the ego ideal. It is used to impel the will to set up resistances against the repetition of such failure and thus to direct the ego toward the attainment of its goal in life.

Its Cure. As suggested before, the sense of guilt is like the "Slough of Despond," and the only way out is either forward or backward; forward through difficulty, to the road of progress that leads to fuller life, or backward into sin. We can get rid of the troublesome sense of guilt by lowering our ego ideal to the standard

of our instinct impulses. Then whatever we do will receive no condemnation from the conscience, for the conscience will be dead. This is the backward step. It is backward into sin. It is also backward into abnormality, for when the unconscious impulses control a life, that life is abnormal. The normal way is forward. The way of advancement is to use the sense of guilt as a guiding influence toward the realization of our ego ideal, submitting to its present unpleasantness for the sake of the larger life to which it leads.

P. C. Wren, the writer of life in the French Foreign Legion, in his short story, the *Coward of the Legion*, gives us a splendid psychological study of the way in which this sense of guilt works, and the only way in which it can be overcome. Jean Dubonnet had risked his life to save a wounded officer, for which he was to receive a medal. Later, on being congratulated by a comrade, he broke forth in self-denunciation, proclaiming himself as an abject coward. The comrade sought to comfort him, but to no avail. Finally, the story was told. Jean had been an Apache in the underworld of Paris. He had loved a woman, who, although unknown to him until too late, was already married. They planned to die together before the husband could return. The woman drank the

fatal poison, but Jean was too weak. His own Apache friends, scorning him, branded his name upon his breast with the words "Liar and Coward." The thought of the *Croix de Guerre* on his tunic and that underneath had brought on the attack of self-reproach. The comrade, however, had a solution, "I will burn it out as it was burned in." Dubonnet wanted an anæsthetic, but the comrade would not hear of it, knowing that the agonizing pain was the only thing that could heal the deeper wound of the soul. When old Jean Dubonnet fell many years later, his colonel remarked, "I have lost my bravest soldier."

The story gives us a clue to the only way in which we can get rid of the sense of guilt—by putting something else in its place. If the record of our sins is written on our heart, the record of forgiveness must be written over it. This is accomplished through the medium of the purifying fire of confession. This is the only way. It is the only way in human relationship. If an individual wrongs a friend, that wrong cannot be erased, for the scar will remain. It can, however, be overcome. A frank acknowledgment of guilt and a plea for forgiveness will fashion a new intimacy which will cover the wound with love. The same process takes place in our relationship with God.

The way of release from the burden of sin is through confession to forgiveness.

C. Contrasts

It is necessary to draw the contrast between the sense of guilt and the inferiority complex in order to dispel the belief that the sense of guilt is merely an evidence of the inferiority complex.

The greatest difference is that the sense of guilt is an indication of the normal functioning of the mind, while the inferiority complex is a proof that the mind is functioning abnormally. Since the sense of guilt has its origin in the conscience, and since the conscience is a function of the consciousness, the sense of guilt must be an activity of the conscious mind. When the consciousness is in active control of the life, that life can be called normal.[12] The sense of guilt, then, is an evidence of normality. The inferiority complex, on the other hand, is the result of a deep feeling of inferiority uncompensated for by achievement and subsequently repressed because of fear to face it, or the cause of a regression because of submission to it. Whether the inferiority complex is due to a repression or a regression, it operates from the hidden regions of the unconscious, and

[12] See Freud, *Collected Papers*, vol. iv, p. 111 (quoted).

in so far as it dominates the life it makes that life abnormal, for when a life is under the whimsical rule of the unconscious, it is abnormal.

Since the sense of guilt is an activity of the consciousness and therefore normal, the picture it gives of the self is a true, even though incomplete, picture. But, because the inferiority complex is located in the unconscious, gaining satisfaction for itself in disguised form and uninterested in reality, the picture it paints of the nature of the self is false.

Another important difference is the contrasting effects they have upon life. The sense of guilt is an integrating influence, because it is purposive. Every emotion is purposive, seeking to guide the activity of the life toward the satisfaction of the instinct it represents. The sense of guilt is the emotion set up to guide the life toward the attainment of the ego ideal. As pointed out before, the integration of personality develops with the progress of the ego toward the ego ideal. Since the sense of guilt aids in that progress, it is an influence for integration. The inferiority complex, on the other hand, is a disintegrating influence. In its expression it will reject any power which would seem to be a possible competitor for its place in the life and it will set up hallucinations,

phantasies, and symptoms, to permit its continuance as the controlling factor. It thus denies both progress and reality and is consequently a disintegrating force in the life.

The last, but perhaps the most interesting contrast between the sense of guilt and the inferiority complex is in the different methods required for their release. The method of cure for the patient with an inferiority complex is by reorientation to reality. Acknowledging his inferiority, he must recognize his ability to take a useful place in the life of his group, to meet its requirements, and satisfy its demands. He is cured by faith in himself. The sense of guilt is cured only by faith in God.

CHAPTER IX

CONFESSION AND REPRESSION

(Turning from Sin)

When the conscience, acting in its capacity as observer, condemns the ego for wrong actions, and the feeling of guilt results, there are three possible modes of conduct open to the conscious mind. The consciousness may do nothing whatever about it, allowing the emotion free play; it may repress the feeling; or it may rid itself of the depressing sensation by means of spiritual catharsis, through confession.

The first possibility is followed by some. Their conscience is active enough, censuring them for their failure to act according to the demands of their ego ideal, and arousing in them a feeling of self-reproach. But they permit the process to end there. They feel conscience-stricken because of their sin, but they labor about in this "Slough of Despond" without seeking a way out. They are consumed by self-reproach, but they do not express the feeling in any activity that would clear the emotional atmosphere. Their behavior arrests the threefold psychic process at

the affect stage. It is morbid self-depreciation, and is akin to the pathological condition in which the patient shows an excessive interest in the symptoms of his disease, a condition known in psychotherapy as hypochondriasis.

The second mode of conduct open to the individual following upon his conviction of sin is to repress the sense of guilt. The unpleasant feeling depresses him, so he represses it. This may be accomplished through the positive means of active repression or by the more passive but equally effective method of unwittingly forgetting or suppressing the objectionable mental experience. In either case the result is the same. The psychic material passes beyond the control of the conscious mind, but continues active in the unconscious.

Both of these methods of dealing with the sense of guilt are abnormal, for they indicate submission to the pleasure-pain motive. Further than that, they do not rid the individual of the sense of guilt, and may cause psychic evil; in the case of the hypochondriac, hysteria may develop, and out of the repression a substitution neurosis may arise. The only healthy and sure way of clearing the mind of the depressing sense of guilt is by acquiring a sense of forgiveness. This can be accomplished solely through the instrumentality of confession.

The process most commonly followed in the effort to get rid of the troublesome sense of guilt is by witting or unwitting repression. Because of this, and since the cure for repression is also the cure for hypochondriasis, and is the psychological practice equivalent to the Christian plan of confession it is needful that we examine this phenomenon in some detail.

A. Repression

Its Origin. While stopping the psychic process at the affect stage usually results in hypochondriasis and may cause hysteria, the number of such cases is small. By far the great majority of neuroses are caused by repression. Almost all of the cases of war neurosis, treated by Rivers and McDougall, and described in their published works, are cases of repressions. So also are most of the examples which Freud, Adler, and Jung present to illustrate the theory and the practice of their therapy.

These repressions may originate in several different ways, but the element common to all is the refusal of conscious existence to the material repressed. "The essence of repression," says Freud, "lies simply in the function of rejecting something out of consciousness."[1] This rejection may be the refusal of entrance

[1] Freud, *Collected Papers*, vol. iv, p. 86.

into the consciousness of unwanted impulses, or it may be the ejection from the consciousness of memories or emotions which are repulsive to the conscious mind or contrary to the demands of the ego ideal.

An individual may have passed through some horrifying experience, the memory of which is so terrible that with each entrance of the recollection into the field of consciousness he again suffers a repetition of the emotional stress which had accompanied the original experience. This recurring emotional strain is so harrowing that he seeks, by every possible means, to rid himself of the memory that causes it. His friends and even his physician, if the resulting nervous state is sufficiently grave to require the help of a doctor, may urge him to seek to forget it or to put it out of his mind. In some instances this effort is successful, and while the conscious mind is no longer aware of the memory or the emotion, they both continue in activity in the unconscious. The surface of the life appears to be undisturbed and calm, but the repression may set up a whirlpool in the unconscious which may undermine the very foundations of the soul.

Generally, however, repressions are made unwittingly. It is a commonplace to remark that those things which we would like most to forget

and which we try hardest to put out of our mind are the things which tenaciously persist. The very effort expended to overcome them provides the power that insures their continued existence. It is the things we think we never could forget which often pass most readily out of memory. When these memories are particularly unpleasant, they are most easily forgotten. It is quite possible, when the experience is exceptionally horrible and the emotions aroused are sufficiently intense, for the record of the occurrence to pass immediately into the unconscious. Almost all of the "shell-shock" patients of the war were men suffering from repressions. Some terrible fear, or awesome experience incident to life at the front, would be too frightful for the conscious mind to harbor, and too gruesome for the human soul to retain. Before it could leave its mark on the consciousness, it was thrust into the unconscious, from which position, according to the measure of its strength, it would disturb and distort the activity of the life. In order to prevent the possible recurrence of such awful sensations, the repression usually generated some functional body disturbance, such as partial paralysis, loss of voice, deafness, blindness, recurring nausea, and so forth. Amnesia of the event which produced the repression, or of a longer period of

the life, generally accompanied the functional disturbance. The amnesia and the physical disorder continued as long as the repression remained in the unconscious, but disappeared when properly recollected and corelated with the rest of the life.

Because of the horrors of modern warfare and the terrific emotional strain of trench life, a great number of cases of repression came under the observation of psychologists. But there are many such instances in civil life as well, and, as has been observed, that which is conspicuous in the life of the neurotic is evident in less marked degree in the psychic activity of all. Freud, in his book, *Psychopathology of Everyday Life*, has given a great many examples of the manner in which minor repressions take place in the lives of all of us. We forget the bills which we owe, although we do not forget the bills which are owed to us. We forget the names of people whom we dislike, although it is no effort to remember the names of those whom we admire. We forget appointments which we would rather not keep, although we always remember engagements that promise pleasure.

In addition to the ejection from the consciousness of the memory of unpleasant experiences, repression may result from the refusal of entry into the consciousness of unwanted impulses.

If, in satisfying the demands of the ego ideal, the conscious mind conceives a certain action to be wrong, it will reject any impulse arising out of the unconscious urging the ego toward that action. A man may be jealous because of the success of a colleague. The jealousy seems, according to his nobler self, to be petty, so, when he feels an urge to say something sarcastic or rude, he represses the impulse and, instead, heaps upon his associate laudatory congratulations, but every congratulatory sentence is a veiled insult. The man is displeased with himself for being unable to say what he wishes to say. He forgets that the feeling in his unconscious mind was behind every remark. The repressed material continued to make itself felt. If the impulse is particularly strong, it will require greater strength of will to restrain it. The stronger the impulse and the stronger the repressing force necessary, the more disastrous is the result. The gradations may vary from the repression of an impulse urging some slight deviation from the ego ideal, to the repression of a strong impulse to perform some act in strict antagonism to the standards of the life. Here, again, the difference between that which does not disturb the equilibrium existing in the mental life of the normal individual and that which leads to abnormality is only a difference

in degree. Daily we repress impulses, slight in power and in significance, which cause no disturbance to the even tenor of our psychic activity. On the other hand, the refusal to recognize strong impulses and to divert their energy into paths leading to the realization of the ego ideal may cause a neurosis, and the subsequent creation of symptoms through which the repressed impulse may gain compensative satisfaction. These symptoms are symbolic acts which the repression surreptitiously forces upon the ego.

There is still a third possible source of repression which seems to be increasing in practice in our modern life. It has been recognized that repression is the cause of most psychic evil and therefore is to be judiciously avoided. We have been told that native instincts are strong enough to force their expression in the life, and if natural expression is forbidden by the consciousness, that they resort to unnatural means of gaining satisfaction. There has developed the notion that since repression may lead to a neurosis and unnatural expression, the instincts and unconscious impulses must be given free exercise. Too often this means unrestricted and unguided exercise. We are advised that if we would save ourselves from becoming neurotic, and would attain our fullest

self-realization, we should "express ourselves." Moral restraints are alleged to have cost more than they are worth and should be done away. Social customs and prohibitions are conceived to be merely inherited tribal taboos which prevent the proper development of individuality and should be superseded by the newly discovered laws of our psychic needs. To enlarge ourselves we must have freedom of action, not in sublimation, but according to the requirements of our own distinctive natures. This conception has resulted in the cult of the individual and the tendency to indulge all of his appetites and desires. In this proposal, however, the whole of man's needs has not been considered. Man is no longer a beast, subject solely to the claims of his animal instincts. During man's development he has acquired what Tansley calls an "ethical self,"[2] which also demands expression. His instincts and unconscious impulses, unless sublimated to conform to this ethical self, cannot be given unrestricted expression without the repression of this other element. The final psychic condition of the man who practices the unguided expression of his instincts and unconscious impulses is worse than the first. He has not only wasted his psychic energy in the untrammeled

[2] Tansley, *The New Psychology*, p. 195.

indulgence of his appetites, but he has developed an unconscious complex due to the repression of his ethical self. In discussing the conflict that goes on between sensual and ascetic tendencies, Freud himself, whose teachings have been erroneously interpreted to support this position, says, "If we were to make victory possible to the sensual side instead, the disregarding forces repressing sexuality would have to indemnify themselves by symptoms."[3] Our repressed ideals would develop complexes.

Its Activity. The act of repression does not dispel the activity of an impulse or rid the individual of the influence of an emotion. The repressed material continues to make itself felt through compensative means. "The process of repression," says Freud, "is not to be regarded as something which takes place once for all, the results of which are permanent, as when some living thing has been killed and from that time onward is dead; on the contrary, repression demands a constant expenditure of energy, . . . and economically its abrogation denotes a saving."[4] It is not dead, but continues to function from the unconscious, influencing the life to adopt behavior which will provide a means by which the associated psychic energy

[3] Freud, *Introductory Lectures*, p. 361.

[4] Freud, *Collected Papers*, vol. iv, p. 89.

may expend itself. Rivers states, "The suppressed experience and the tendencies associated therewith may have a kind of independent existence, and may act indirectly upon or modify consciousness even when incapable of recall by any of the ordinary processes of memory."[5] This influence may be exerted in one of three different ways, according to the power of the repression.

The repressed material may, without our conscious knowledge, control some of our everyday actions in a manner which will give expression to its desires and exercise to its energy. This may be of a mild nature, not interfering very seriously with the normal conduct of our lives. The man who sought to congratulate his colleague and found himself surreptitiously implying insults, may have felt ill at ease, but the incident could not result in grave harm. In some cases, however, the repression may more seriously affect our lives by means of an obsessional neurosis under the domination of which we are unable to control our own actions. The individual's mind "is occupied with thoughts that do not really interest him, he feels impulses which seem alien to him, and he is impelled to perform actions which not only afford him no pleasure, but from which he

[5] Rivers, *Instinct and the Unconscious*, p. 69.

is powerless to desist."[6] His life becomes a constant struggle with forces from within himself and before which he is impotent.

The repression may affect the life by means of some kind of phobia. An individual under the power of a phobia suffers intense fear from some particular kind of object or situation. The nature of the object or situation which arouses the fear is an indication of the character of the repression which is thus making itself felt. For example, a soldier may have repressed the memory and the emotions of a fearful experience which occurred at the time of the explosion of a large shell. If a phobia is subsequently set up by the repression, every sudden or loud noise, the slam of a door, or the sharp bark of a dog, will drive him into paroxysms of uncontrollable fear.

The third mode of influence that may be exerted by the repression is through a dissociation. In a dissociation, "The nervous elements concerned in the recollection of an (emotionally disturbing) incident are relatively isolated or dissociated from other parts of the cognitive apparatus."[7] Amnesia of the occurrence which caused the repression and some degree of dissociation of the personality are the

[6] Freud, *Introductory Lectures*, p. 219.

[7] McDougall, *Outline of Abnormal Psychology*, p. 456.

results. In the cases of the war neuroses, most of the dissociations took the form of loss of function of some organ of the body, but it is not always so. In some instances the dissociation takes the form of automatic behavior or of a fugue, in which the individual continues to act in an apparently normal way, although he himself is unable later to recall any part of his actions during that time. His conscious mind seems to give up control of his body for a period, during which the repressed material assumes charge. Most of us have had some such experience. We suddenly realize that we have not been consciously guiding our activity. We find ourselves doing something we do not remember having consciously chosen to do, or going in a direction contrary to our conscious desires. In more serious cases the dissociation may result in dual or multiple personality.

Its Cure. There have been several theories of cathartic method proposed for the cure of psychic illness caused by repression. In the early days of psychoanalysis it was assumed that the repressed idea was surcharged with psychic energy. The union of this oversupply of libido with the repressed memory was conceived to be the cause of every instance of psychic difficulty. It was thought that if the patient could again pass through the emotional

experience which he had undergone at the time of the generation of the repression, the pent-up psychic energy would be released and the neurosis healed. This therapeutic practice was named Abreaction, and for some time was the only therapy used by the psychoanalysts. The analyst sought to discover the particular experience responsible for the repression, and then, by means of hypnosis or waking suggestion, he aroused within his patient the same emotional state in which the repression had taken place. If the first repetition did not effect a cure, the patient was put through the ordeal again, and perhaps many times. It was gradually discovered that, although temporary relief followed in most cases, yet the number of permanent cures was comparatively small, and some patients became worse. This seems like a natural sequence, for the question raised by McDougall appears to be quite pertinent, "If living through a scene of horror produces a psychoneurotic disorder, why should the living through it a second time cure or tend to cure it?"[8]

It was discovered that the essential element in the cure was the break-up of the dissociation. It was seen that with the use of abreaction those cases which were cured had been freed

[8] McDougall, *Outline of Abnormal Psychology*, p. 454.

from the harmful dissociation by bringing the repressed content of the unconscious into the consciousness. It was thought, therefore, that the only thing necessary to accomplish a cure was for the analyst to identify the unconscious matter and then tell the patient what it was. Some success followed the use of this method, and patients usually improved under its application. Complete cures, however, were rare, and patients, after the cessation of treatment, gradually fell back into their neurosis. This method failed because the consciousness became aware of the content of the repression by intellectual acknowledgment rather than by emotional realization. "Our knowledge of what is unconscious in him is not equivalent to his knowledge of it," says Freud. "When we tell him what we know, he does not assimilate it *in place of* his own unconscious thoughts, but *alongside* of them, and very little has been changed."[9]

A highly successful therapy was finally evolved. It was recognized that "making the unconscious conscious" had to be a process within the mind of the patient. "Psychoanalytic treatment is a kind of re-education,"[10] says Freud. The patient is led to see himself

[9] Freud, *Introductory Lectures*, p. 364. (Italics are his.)
[10] Freud, *Ibid.*, p. 377.

in his true light. The analyst helps the patient to draw the repressed material into his consciousness by means of dream interpretation, free association, and suggestion. When the patient becomes fully aware of the nature and cause of his neurosis, the symptoms of his disease disappear and the dissociation ceases to exist. The emotion whose violent exercise caused the repression continues as an activity in the life, but because it is no longer in a dissociation it cannot wreak any harm. It is recognized, acknowledged, and controlled. This process, which Freud terms re-education, is the same as Adler's "re-orientation to reality," Jung's "re-adaptation," and McDougall's "re-integration." The method of procedure is practically the same with each.

While it is observed that the neurosis does not disappear until the patient himself recognizes its cause, challenges its mastery, and assumes control of his own life, yet it must also be noted that the relation which exists between the analyst and his patient determines whether or not the cure will be accomplished. Only when the patient has a feeling of confidence and trust in the physician will he reveal the true content of his dreams, unhesitatingly acknowledge his free associations, and respond freely to suggestion. In other words, when the

patient has faith in his physician he confesses his faults and thus enters into larger life.

B. Confession

As stated at the beginning of this chapter there are three modes of response to the feeling of guilt which arise out of the conviction of sin. We may feel oppressed by it, but do nothing to relieve it; we may force it out of our minds; or we may confess it.

The first method is wrong because it leads to hypochondriasis, and results in a deeper sense of sin. If two friends quarrel to the extent of bitterness and separation, they renew their fellowship only when the cause of the breach is recognized, acknowledged, and forgiven. Each may feel sorry, each may feel responsible, but neither may seek to heal it. Each may admit his sorrow and his guilt to some third party, but until they face each other on common ground, and with mutual sympathy acknowledge the cause of the rupture, their fellowship will never be restored. If sin is that which separates from God we cannot get rid of it by being sorry, we must acknowledge it. If sin is wrong against God, it is to God we must confess it.

We have seen that repression also is wrong. Unpleasant psychic material may be ejected

from the consciousness, but it continues active from the unconscious. The sense of guilt can be forgotten, but it continues to exist in some form until it is forgiven.

The only healthful and sure method of attaining freedom from the sense of guilt is by confession. There are three methods of dealing with a flesh wound which are analogous to these three methods of dealing with the conviction of sin. The wound may be kept open and inflamed by constant irritation. Healing cannot possibly result. Or it may be tightly bound at the surface; but its poisons will fester and rankle underneath, circulating throughout the system and thus causing far more serious damage. The only successful and hygienic treatment is to clear the wound of any putrefaction and permit nature to effect the cure. This healing always begins at the base of the wound and works upward. The surface is the last to heal. A scar may always be evident at the place of the wound, but it will be a clean scar, and the evidence of healthful healing. If the sense of guilt is a painful wound to our soul caused by pernicious sin, the only spiritually healthful method, and the only certain method, of effecting a cure is by clearing away the corrupt evil by means of confession. To keep the wound open by hypochondriatic irritation

is to deepen it and to extend its harmful effects and at the same time to prevent wholesome recovery. To repress the feeling is to close the surface and to lock up the defilements within, where they will continue to fester. The only safe way is to purge the wound of its corrosive sin by means of confession, and to let God complete the cure with forgiveness. The cure takes place from within outward and the surface is the last to heal. A scar may remain and we shall always know that it was caused by our sin, but it will be a clean scar and the evidence of healthful healing.

This cure cannot be effected by abreaction. There are those who repeatedly make confession of their sins, passing through a most harrowing emotional experience with each repetition, but who are unable to attain emancipation from the depressing sense of their guilt. This is because they are merely reliving the emotional experience of conviction of sin. Instead of relief, such a process brings only further despair. John Bunyan, as pointed out by Pratt,[11] gives us, in his *Grace Abounding*, the story of the extreme working of this practice in his own life. He would rehearse his sins and perhaps gain some feeling of freedom, until the realization of some other sin would enter his consciousness, when

[11] Cf. Pratt, *The Religious Consciousness*, pp. 140-45.

the awful depression would return in all its intensity to rob him of his hope. This progression continued until Bunyan, believing he had committed the unpardonable sin, passed through all the mental sufferings of the damned.

Nor will the repetition of confessions suggested by another bring any real delivery. It may be easier for someone else to see our faults than for us, but for them to know our sins is different from our knowledge of them, and even should they tell us, we do not necessarily assimilate that knowledge. What we need is an answer to Burns' prayer:

> "O wad some Power the giftie gie us
> To see oursels as ithers see us!"

The process of ridding ourselves of the sense of guilt is the same process as that practiced by the psychologist in overcoming a repression. After we have recognized our sin and realized our sin, we must acknowledge our sin. If there is to be a re-establishment of right relation, that acknowledgment must be made to Him against whom the sin was committed.

"If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us."[12] This is the result of repression. But, "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our

[12] 1 John 1. 8.

sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness."[13] This is the only method of spiritual catharsis. In this case also the Christian doctrine of sin has the support of the new psychology.

[13] 1 John 1. 9.

CHAPTER X

FORGIVENESS AND TRANSFERENCE

(Release from Sin)

FORGIVENESS is the re-establishment of a right relationship between persons after a rupture has been caused. When the bonds of a human friendship have been severed by the commission of some wrong, confession alone will not heal the breach. There must be a redirection of the affections of each toward the other. Or, if the person wronged has not ceased to love and has wanted to forgive the friend guilty of wrongdoing, it is still essential, before forgiveness can take place, for the one who was guilty of the wrong action to turn in love toward the person wronged and in sincerity of heart to seek forgiveness. It is only with the redirection of affection that confession makes forgiveness possible. It is common in our everyday life that when an apology is made because of the application of pressure, either in the case of the schoolboy in the fear of punishment from his teacher, or the man in the dread of a suit for libel, a right relationship is not re-established; because the affections continue to remain withdrawn.

What is true of forgiveness in human relationships is true of the relations between man and God. When a man sins, he breaks the fetters of love which have held him in fellowship with God. Confession will accomplish no healing succor for the sinner, nor bring about the renewal of divine fellowship unless such confession grows out of a rebirth of love, which can only be effected through the instrumentality of Christ.

How it is possible for Christ to accomplish this mediation has received new confirmatory demonstration from the new psychology in the part played by the analyst in redirecting the libido of his patient toward a suitable objective upon which his psychic energy can be normally expended. In dissociation, an emotion is fixated upon an unnatural or impossible person or object and the psychic energy is expended without giving satisfaction. In psychoanalytical treatment this fixation becomes transferred to the physician, who helps his patient to reassociate the emotion and its libido with the proper person or object upon which the psychic energy can be rightfully expended and toward which the emotion can be a normal psychic activity. The regular recurrence of this phenomenon in every treatment was first observed by Freud and named by him Transference.

A. Transference

Its Definition. In describing the rise of this phenomenon Freud points out that the first feeling a patient has toward the analyst is generally a feeling of antagonism. There is an undercurrent of objection to the physician's prying into the intimate incidents of the patient's life. There is resistance to every suggestion. But this gradually changes and the analyst observes "that the patient, who ought to be thinking of nothing but the solution of his own distressing conflicts, begins to develop a particular interest in the person of the physician."[1] This interest continues to grow until the patient comes to look upon the analyst as a wonderfully gifted personage, enjoying powers and endowed with virtues far beyond those possessed by other men. The analysis makes splendid progress under these conditions, for the patient is eager to follow every lead and to respond to every suggestion. A general improvement follows this harmonious relationship.

There is often, however, a negative transference, in which state a definite resistance is set up against the efforts of the analyst. A

[1] Freud, *Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, p. 367; see pp. 367 to 374; also Treatise on *Dynamics of Transference*, *Collected Papers*, vol. ii, pp. 377-91.

hostility develops against the physician and the patient fails to respond to his guidance. This takes place in many male patients and with some women patients after the positive transference has led them into complete submission to the guidance of the physician.

Because of his premise that every psychic activity can be proven to be a manifestation of the sex motive, Freud asserts that positive transference is the evidence that the patient is falling in love with the physician. It is not a normal attachment, however, for the emotion which in the dissociation was fixated upon some unnatural person or object, for example, a parent, a member of one's own sex, or a fetish, has merely been changed, because of the intimacy of the relationship, to the physician, who is also an unnatural objective for the libido. The feeling may be sublimated and in that case it becomes a distinct aid to analysis. But when unsublimated and the patient comes finally to realize the nature of his affection for the physician, there is aroused an inner opposition, which establishes a resistance and results in a negative transference.

Narcissistic patients provide the only exceptions to transference in psychoanalytical treatment. They turn from the analyst, not in hostility, but in indifference, because their

libido is turned inward upon themselves. "Therefore," says Freud, "they are not to be influenced by him; what he says leaves them cold, makes no impression on them, and therefore the process of cure which can be carried through with others, the revivification of the pathogenic conflict and the overcoming of the resistance due to the repressions, cannot be effected with them."[2] Jung agrees with Freud that there are only two possible reactions to treatment, either transference or narcissism, and that the road to health is through transference. "The two fundamental mechanisms of the psychoses," he says, "transference and introversion, are to a wide extent extremely appropriate methods of normal reaction against complexes; transference as a means of escaping from the complex into reality; introversion as a means of detaching one's self from reality through the complex."[3]

Only when there is a positive transference can a cure be effected. With narcissism, relief from the neurosis is impossible, and, where there is a negative transference, it must be changed into a positive transference before the physician can be of any aid to the patient. When the positive transference has developed to its

[2] Freud, *Introductory Lectures*, p. 374.

[3] Jung, *Psychology of the Unconscious*, p. 111.

highest possibilities and the patient is responsive to every suggestion of the analyst, he is shown that his feelings have not originated in the current situation and do not really concern the person of the physician. They have been transferred to him from a dissociation. When this emotion is consciously transferred to some more suitable person, the patient may be said to be free from his dissociation and on the way to the proper integration of his personality.

McDougall rightly objects to Freud's insistence that the transference phenomenon is the result of sexual love, and maintains that it is nothing more than heightened suggestibility growing out of respect. "It is . . . natural," he says, "that a skillful and experienced physician should be able . . . to obtain the respect and even admiration of the patient, and thus render him amenable to suggestion, docile, and ready to accept the physician's views, interpretations, and reasonings."[4] An examination of the dynamics of transference, as exhibited in the practice of other psychologists, shows that the true nature of this phenomenon lies somewhere between these extremes. It is certainly not sex love, nor is it merely cold respect. It is a warm devotion, a tender affection, which

[4] McDougall, *Outline of Abnormal Psychology*, p. 425.

begets deep faith. It is a feeling akin to that which we have toward a beloved and trusted family physician. We may have great respect for a noted specialist, but we have love for our own doctor. He knows us through and through. He knows our minds as well as he knows our bodies. He has seen us stripped of superficialities when we have had to face some hard reality. He knows our mistakes, our faults, our failures. And he knows our plans, our hopes, and our ambitions. He has been very close in times of deep distress, and his wise counsel has strengthened us. We love him and have deep faith in him. We are willing that he should know all about us, and in time of illness we follow in confidence his every suggestion. It is an attitude and sympathy of feeling such as this which is the basis of transference in psychotherapy.

Its Power. The power and the possibilities of the transference rest in the faith which grows out of this high regard. "In so far as his (the patient's) transference bears the positive sign," says Freud, "it clothes the physician with authority, transforms itself into faith in his findings, and in his views. Without this kind of transference or with a negative one, the physician and his arguments would never even be listened to. Faith repeats the history of its

own origin; it is a derivative of love and at first it needed no arguments."[5] Where there is true affection there is faith.

The psychoanalysts admit that where this faith has been wanting, they have failed to accomplish a cure. Freud tells of a patient who, at the first treatment, after describing the nature of her symptoms, responded rather coldly to further inquiry, and said that she had no other associations, thoughts, or recollections, and, after two hours, declared that she felt quite well and was certain that the morbid idea would not return. It did return. She was not cured, because she had not had the time nor the inclination to develop a transference. She lacked faith in the analyst.[6] Adler also admits defeat when a patient left him because of "the severity of her disease, her unapproachability, and her incapacity for true human friendship."[7] That is to say, she did not have faith in him or in his methods. Rivers tells of an officer who finally was forced to relinquish his commission because of lack of improvement under treatment. The failure resulted from the absence

---

[5] Freud, *Introductory Lectures*, p. 372. It must be remembered that by "love" Freud here means sexual attraction, while I mean tender affection.

[6] Freud, *Introductory Lectures*, pp. 211 to 215.

[7] Adler, *Individual Psychology*, p. 143.

of faith in the remedies proposed or in the physician proposing them.[8]

It would appear that the basic element in all successful psychoanalytical treatment is this unbounded faith in the physician and the consequent belief in the adequacy of his therapy, developing as a part of the phenomenon of transference. Transference is universally used by the analysts to effect a cure, but only the presence of the element of personal faith makes the transference possible. They may differ radically in their interpretations of the causes of the neuroses and they may differ in theories of therapy, but they all use the faith of their patients to accomplish the cure. It would be absurd to suppose that only patients suffering from a sex neurosis should seek out Freud, or only those with an unsatisfied quest for power should go to Adler, or those who have failed in adaptation should present themselves for treatment to Jung. Yet each school diagnoses the cases coming under its attention according to its own doctrine of the nature of the neuroses, and in a great many instances effects an improvement or a cure. This cure, however, takes place only when there is a transference. Improvement results only when the patient clothes the physician with great wisdom and

[8] Rivers, *Instinct and the Unconscious*, pp. 193, 194.

power and is willing to follow his every lead and suggestion. The patient hears his neurosis diagnosed as the result of one condition or another according to the school of psychoanalysis to which he has resorted.[9] But his neurosis is healed according to the measure of his own faith. If we could imagine a man with a certain neurosis being able to go to several different psychoanalysts, submitting himself to treatment, and making a transference on each one, he might be cured in each instance. Adler describes a case which might be used as an example.[10] A remarkably gifted man became engaged to a girl of high character. He then sought to force upon her his ideals of education, which made severe demands upon her. Under this pressure she finally broke the engagement, and the man became a prey to various nervous attacks. Adler diagnosed the case as resulting from a sense of inferiority, having its origin in the man's boyhood, when,

[9] Fortunately, this condition in psychotherapy will not last for long. The School of Integral Psychology, under the leadership of McDougall, is teaching a purer diagnosis. Still depending upon amicable relations between the patient and the analyst to provide the means for the cure, the psychophysicians of this school seek a more accurate diagnosis to direct the manner of the cure. When this becomes common in psychoanalytical practice, a larger percentage of cures will result.

[10] Adler, *Individual Psychology*, pp. 10 to 12.

an only child, he had lived with his widowed mother, more or less cut off from the world. With this diagnosis Adler effected a cure. Freud would have found an infantile Œdipus complex to be the cause of the neurosis, and might have accomplished a cure. Jung would have seen a mother-fixation and the failure of the man to adapt himself to the larger demands of adult life, and might have guided the patient into normal acceptance of reality. The cure in each case, however, would have resulted from the man's faith in the physician and a willingness to accept his suggestions, rather than because of exact diagnosis.

The element common to all of the different methods of the mental healing of functional disorders is this faith on the part of the patient. In Christian Science it is faith in oneself to rise above the errors which have caused the physical disturbances. In psychoanalysis it is faith in the physician and in his ability to lead one out of the neurotic complex. In Christian faith-healing it is faith in God and his power over matter. But Christ himself was the first to say, "Thy faith hath made thee whole."[11]

B. Forgiveness

Release from sin is achieved through faith in

[11] Luke 18. 42.

Christ just as liberation from a neurosis is accomplished through transference to the psychoanalyst. The sinner's recognition and confession of his sin become effectual in freeing him from his sin only as he is able to establish a personal relationship with Christ, who, acting as mediator between man and God, transfers that relationship to God, the Father. God is the final objective of spiritual love. He alone can satisfy our spiritual needs. When our spiritual libido is fixated elsewhere, we are spiritually unhealthy. Christ transfers our affections to God and, with the establishment of right relations with him, we can make full confession. With the confession made possible by the transference we experience the spiritual catharsis of forgiveness. The personal relationship with Christ, the relationship which makes possible the transference to God, and the subsequent confession and forgiveness, is a relationship resting solely in faith—faith that is born of love.

Relationship With Christ. The call of the prophets and of John the Baptist had been, "Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."[12] It was a summons to the recognition and confession of sin. The ministry of Jesus was built around that which alone could make such recognition and confession effectual unto

[12] Matt. 3. 2.

forgiveness. His appeal was the voice of love, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."[13] The personal relationship established with him was to be the means whereby men might gain freedom from their sin and find the kingdom of heaven within their own hearts.

In some cases this relationship is the result of a natural growth, and the individual gradually develops an intimate fellowship with Christ without any conscious or directed effort. With many, however, the process may pass through the stage of resistance so often noticed by the psychoanalysts in the mechanics of transference. Paul provides the classic example of the way in which an individual may oppose the establishment of this personal relationship until "the love of Christ constraineth" him. The evidence of the resistance set up by such individuals is the same as the evidence of resistance to the transference in analytical treatment. There is either violent opposition or extravagant submission. Those who, like Paul, are of the positive type, fiercely oppose any influence which may seem to be swaying them to a change of attitude. Every impulse to Christlike behavior is vigorously repressed and every suggestion to make him the master of

[13] Matt. 11. 28.

their life is passionately repelled. Others—and their name is legion—unwittingly resist the call of Christ in spite of apparent complete submission. In psychoanalysis, the physician often finds a patient resisting the treatment by responding to every suggestion and submitting to every inquiry, but never telling the whole truth. He seeks to lead the physician away from any real knowledge of his inner life by telling him halftruths. He does this because, under the domination of his unconscious, he is unable to find that profound faith which alone can free him from his neurosis. Similarly, many fail truly to follow Christ. They hear his voice, "Come unto me," and turn in his direction, but follow afar off. They go through the motions of answering his call. They go to church, repeat prayers, and make confessions, but all without any true relation to reality. They do not really worship, pray, or confess, but go through the superficial performance of these exercises, in order that they may hide some cherished sin which holds them in bondage.

Gradually Christ's love may break down the resistances whether they are the result of active opposition or passive but unreal submission. We find ourselves, willingly or unwillingly, drawn by the power of his love into fellowship with him. We wonder at our own stupidity

for having refused him and we marvel at his grace. There develops within us an unbounded faith in him. As in the phenomenon of transference, it too is a faith that is born of love. No one has faith in Christ until he loves him. He may believe in the historic Jesus, he may acknowledge his perfection, he may even assert that only in the principles of Jesus can the world find a solution for its problems, but not until he loves Christ does he say, "My Lord and my God."

This transference to Christ is possible for all, except to those who are spiritually narcissistic. Except for those whose libido is fixated upon themselves there are no "elect," psychologically speaking, who alone are able to profit by the experience of transference. "The capacity," says Freud, "for the radiation of libido toward other persons in object-investment (i.e., the ability of transference) must, of course, be ascribed to all normal people; the tendency to transference in all neurotics, so called, is only an exceptional intensification of a universal characteristic."[14] The universality of this capacity for transference makes the kingdom of Christ not merely a visionary hope within the minds of Christians, but an actual possibility for individuals and for society. Only those who, because of indulgence in self-love, are unable

[14] Freud, *Introductory Lectures*, p. 373.

to make the transference to Christ, are for that reason kept from fellowship with him. If we are too much interested in ourselves we cannot be interested in him. We turn from him, not in hostility, but in indifference. But if we can transfer to him the affection we bear to the things of the world, or the love we have for ourselves, there is hope of our moral and spiritual salvation.

The perfect transference in psychoanalytical treatment has been made when the patient lives his entire life according to what he conceives to be the will of the analyst. Likewise, the transference upon Christ has reached its highest possible stage when we can say with Paul, "It is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me."[15]

Transference to God. Man has always sought to put himself into harmonious relationship with the reality that is behind the appearance of things. The yearning in the hearts of all has been the same as Philip's aspiration, "Show us the Father, and it sufficeth us."[16] Christ's reply is the answer, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father. . . . I am in the Father, and the Father in me."[17] Christ is the only means by

[15] Gal. 2. 20.
[16] John 14. 8.
[17] John 14. 9.

which we can establish right relations with God. "I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father, but by me."[18] He is the Great Physician through whom alone we can make transference from the things of the earth to things above. He redirects our affections to the natural objective of our spiritual love—God, the Father. By faith in him we learn to love God. This idea of Christ acting as the channel of transference gives us a new concept of the meaning of Christ as our Great High Priest, who mediates between us and the Father. A neurotic can make no transference except through someone who understands the nature of his fixation and who also knows the natural objective of his affections. So Christ alone is able to make the transference between a sinner and God, because he alone has perfect relationship with God and perfect understanding of the sinner's need for a like relationship.

There have been many attempts to make the proper transference of man's affections to God apart from the relationship with Christ. But while many such efforts have been aids in taking man's thoughts and inclinations away from his sin, they have not been successful in bringing his soul into perfect fellowship with God. The reason for the failure by others is that, while

[18] John 14. 6.

the transference is an essential phase of spiritual development, no one except Christ knows perfectly the only true objective of our spiritual love.

Because of the universality of the capacity for transference, many people, while they turn their affections from the things of the world, do not turn them to God, but fixate their spiritual libido elsewhere. There have been many who have sought to lead people to a perfect fellowship with God, who themselves have been made the objective of transference. Confucius never wished to be the object of spiritual love, hoping only to lead people to right living by means of right philosophy, yet Confucius is worshiped by millions. Buddha, seeking absorption in ultimate reality for himself, came to be the object of adoration as an incarnation of that reality. But God is the only natural and, therefore, the only soul-satisfying objective toward which we can express our spiritual affections, and Christ is the only person through whom the redirection of that love can be accomplished.

Transference, the Channel of Forgiveness. It is only as we are able through Christ to effect this re-direction of spiritual affection upon God that we can secure forgiveness. Only when there is a positive transference upon the phy-

sician in psychoanalytical treatment is it possible for the patient to bring into the light of his consciousness the unconscious complexes which have been the cause of his neurosis. Only when he has faith in his physician will he respond easily to suggestion and will his free associations reveal the nature of his illness. Only when the unconscious has become conscious, and only when his life has again come under the guidance of his ego ideal, will mental health result. The process is the same for forgiveness. There must be a positive transference to God through Christ before we are able truly to confess our sins. Without that relationship any confession is a formality devoid of purifying efficacy. When that relationship exists, confession comes naturally and freely. With confession we experience the spiritual catharsis of forgiveness, and enter into the larger life of fellowship with God. As long as the relationship continues, sin has no more dominion over us.

CHAPTER XI

SANCTIFICATION AND SUBLIMATION
(Freedom from Sin)

FORGIVENESS is not all. Man must not only be released from the result of sin, he must be freed from the power of sin. The spiritual catharsis following upon the confession of our sin to God, and the transference of our affections upon God, rids us of the depressing sense of guilt which we experience because of past sin. It does not, however, rid us of the impulse to evil, the acceptance of which was the cause of the sin. Some further development, to preclude the future submission to like impulses, is necessary. This development is known in Christianity as sanctification.

The purpose of Christianity is to save man from sin and to save him for God. Saving does not merely mean reclaiming or bringing back that which has been lost. It means also "not wasting." Saving, in the sense of reclaiming those who have been lost in sin, is accomplished through forgiveness. Saving, in the sense of not wasting the spiritual energy potent in all of us, is effected through sanctification.

The psychic process, similar in nature and activity to sanctification, has been termed by the psychologists, Sublimation, and is recommended as the only means of circumventing some degree of repression or regression. Native instincts demand expression, but the ego ideal of the individual and the ethical standards of society proscribe their unrestricted exercise in natural activity. Their libido must therefore be diverted into other channels. When these channels give expression to instinct energy in a way which satisfies the ego ideal and which also makes a contribution to the life of the group, the instincts are said to be sublimated and their activity is called sublimated activity.

Sublimation leads an individual toward complete integration within himself and into harmony with his environment. Sanctification guides him toward the perfection of holiness and into communion with God.

A. Sublimation

Its Nature and Necessity. Freud has provided us with what has come to be the classic illustration of the nature and interrelation of the conscious and the unconscious minds,[1] and this can be elaborated to show the character and necessity of sublimation. The unconscious

[1] Freud, *Introductory Lectures*, p. 249.

is likened to a large anteroom in which a great many different mental excitations are crowding upon one another. Some of these try to pass through a door which leads to a reception room. In this smaller compartment the consciousness resides. At the threshold there stands one who carefully guards the door. He permits entrance only to those mental excitations which are acceptable to the consciousness. He rejects all others and forcefully ejects any which gain admission surreptitiously. This, Freud says, is the censor. It so happens that certain of the individual excitations in the anteroom are so well able to disguise their true nature and to appear as suitable associates of the consciousness that the censor grants them admission to the reception chamber. Their actions, however, after being admitted to the society of the élite, are such as to disturb the concord existing among the others whose presence is due to their entire harmony with the consciousness. The censor is unable to banish the agitators because of their disguise as legitimate guests. As long as they remain in the consciousness there is discord in the life. This discord is the evidence of a neurosis. It used to be thought that, in order to dispel the agitation and to restore peace within the consciousness, it would be necessary only to tear off the disguise of the

trouble-makers and reveal their true nature to the consciousness. While this did away with the tension which resulted from the presence of the unrecognized impulses among the recognized and acknowledged conscious motives, it was not sufficient to bring back complete harmony. The unwanted impulses were now recognized and could therefore be prevented from seriously disturbing the life, but they were still unwanted. It was discovered that the only way to effect true concord was to refine the uncouth impulses and make them into social beings. This is accomplished through sublimation.

Sublimation is the redirection of instinct energy away from its expression in the crude original form of the instinct impulse and into refined and creative activity which will satisfy the urge of the instinct, aid in the realization of the ego ideal, and contribute to the æsthetic and ethical progress of society.

Such activity is essential to the psychic health of the individual. There are only two methods of behavior possible in response to an instinct impulse, either expression or repression. Since repression begets disintegration, the energy accompanying the instinct impulses must be utilized in active expression. This expression must be in activity which is in accord with the standards of the ego ideal. To

grant the instincts expression in activity which is contrary to these standards requires the repression of the ego ideal. This would be as disastrous in its psychic consequences as repression of the impulses. To lower the ego ideal to the standard of the impulses is also wrong, for, as we have seen,[2] when a life is guided by the pleasure principle of the unconscious, that life is abnormal. The only method of using the libido of the instincts to make mental health certain is to grant expression in sublimated activity. "Of the present age," says McDougall, "it may be said that it oscillates uncertainly between undue repression and its opposite, 'free living,' or the cult of self-expression; and that the one is as harmful as the other. What is needed is wise sublimation of the repressed forces, in the light of clear and frank self-knowledge and under the guidance of high ideals and well-tried moral traditions."[3]

Its Operation and Results. Sublimation functions only in those lives which are organized around a life sentiment or a life purpose strong enough in its power to force the co-ordination of every phase of the life toward its realization. Tansley affirms that "some kind of harmonization between the conations resulting from differ-

[2] See pp. 222-224.

[3] McDougall, *Outline of Abnormal Psychology*, pp. 476, 477.

ent instincts is a necessity to the developed mind. The most satisfying and complete harmony can only be attained by combining conflicting conations in a higher conation, by the process of integration, . . "[4] and McDougall asserts that "the only sentiment which can adequately fulfill the function of dominating and harmonizing all other sentiments is the sentiment of self-regard, taking the form of a self-conscious devotion to an ideal of character."[5]

Normal individuals gradually develop such a sentiment toward some ideal of life. The analyst, after he has helped his patient to clear away the cause of his neurosis, seeks to guide him to the acceptance of an ideal standard, around which his various psychic activities can be co-ordinated. After the cultivation of such an aspiration the different instinct impulses must be consciously guided in their expression to secure the achievement of the life purpose. If their normal exercise would defeat the accomplishment of the ideal, they are transferred—sublimated—into expressions which will increase the possibilities of its attainment.

For example, a boy in high school may develop a life purpose to become a great lawyer. His instinct of self-display, which has been

[4] Tansley, *The New Psychology*, p. 190.

[5] McDougall, *Outline of Abnormal Psychology*, p. 526.

expressed in the wearing of conspicuously flashy clothing, is sublimated, and the boy takes a leading part in the literary society. The instinct of self-display is satisfied and the sublimated activity is an aid to the attainment of the life purpose. His pugnacious instinct, which has been expressed on the athletic field, is now manifested in the activities of the debating club. The intellectual combat satisfies the instincts, and the activity is an aid toward the realization of the ideal. The instinct of curiosity is transferred in its operation to those studies which are co-ordinate with the master sentiment. The boy loses interest in the solving of the problems of geometry, but he leads his class in history, literature, and civics. The same process takes place in the moral sphere with the adoption of an ideal of character with a high standard of ethics. Instincts, which in their natural expression would prevent realization of the ideal, are expressed in sublimated activity which helps in the effort toward its attainment.

The results of sublimation are: satisfaction for the instincts through the expenditure of their energy, integration for the ego with advance toward the ego ideal, and progress for society through the socialization of the instinct impulses.

The instincts are satisfied because in sublimation they are expressed in activity which is cognate to their nature. In the example used above, the pugnacious instinct which has been further sublimated from the physical contests of the athletic field to the intellectual contests of the debating platform is just as vigorously exercised psychically in its sublimation and consequently just as satisfying to the self. The maternal instinct, when it has been unable to express itself naturally, can be completely satisfied in sublimation, if the individual is able to expend her instinct energy in mothering a person or a group, or even through nurturing and fostering some worthy cause. The sublimated activity must always be cognate to the natural exercise of the instinct, and when it is so related the instinct impulses are satisfied.

Through sublimation also integration results for the ego, because the conflict between the ego ideal and the unconscious impulses is eliminated, and life moves toward the fulfillment of the life purpose. Psychically, a conflict is the clash of incompatible motives. When an unconscious impulse which is prompted by an instinct seeking expression is incompatible with the conscious, motived by the ego ideal, a conflict results. This conflict continues, with the wastage of psychic energy and the possibility

of a neurosis, as long as the opposite motives remain incompatible. These motives, however, need not clash. The instinct can gain satisfaction and the ego ideal can be appeased if the incompatibility is resolved by giving the instinct sublimated expression in accord with the standards of the ego ideal.

Sublimation of the natural instincts brings progress in culture, refinement, and intellectual advancement to society. This is such an accepted fact to the psychologists that McDougall makes the statement that "sublimation is civilization."[6] The artist and the poet use the energy and emotion accompanying their sex or love instinct to produce their masterpieces of art and literature. The scientist uses his instinct of curiosity to delve into the mysteries of the world and to unravel its problems. The business man uses his constructive instinct to build the great organizations common in our modern commercial life. Doctors, teachers, ministers, and social workers use the surplus energy of their parental instinct to nurture the physical, mental, moral, and social life of their age.

B. Sanctification

Its Nature and Necessity. As in the psychical

[6] McDougall, *Outline of Abnormal Psychology*, p. 476.

realm, so in the realm of the spirit man cannot remain static. If there is no progression, there is regression. It is not only necessary for the psychoanalyst to lead his patient out of his neurosis; it is necessary also to guide him, through the sublimated use of his instincts, into greater integration of his personality. If this last step is not taken, the conflict which generated the first neurosis continues and may effect a new repression, and an even more serious neurotic disorder may result. So also in the realm of the spirit, forgiveness frees us from the burden of past sin, but temptations nevertheless continue to present themselves to the consciousness, and unless they can be transformed in their expression to aid the individual's spiritual development, they will gain renewed power for evil in the life, and deeper and more obstinate sin will ensue. A careless and destructive tenant may be ejected from a dwelling house. The landlord may thoroughly renovate and restore the house to its original state. He may close it and believe that it can come to no further harm. But the house does not long maintain its fresh cleanliness. Dirt sifts in from without and decay takes place within. A new tenant is needed, with an interest in preserving the freshness of the restoration and with a zeal for still further beautifying the

premises. So it is with our souls. Even if thoroughly purified through forgiveness, we cannot continue so unless we put ourselves under the care of a new tenant, one who is interested in keeping the benefits of the renewal and in further ennobling our souls. We must not only be dead to our old selves, we must be alive to the new. It is not enough to have put sin out of our hearts, the Spirit of God must be taken in.

This giving of our lives into the guidance of the Holy Spirit is the beginning of sanctification. In sanctification we not only turn from sin, but we turn to God, and under the guidance of his Spirit we progress toward the perfection of holiness. We no longer either accept or reject temptations. We sanctify them. We employ natural impulses for the attainment of spiritual ends. "Where sin abounded, grace did abound more exceedingly,"[7] and we grow in Christlikeness.

This progression is essential not merely to save us from reverting into sin, but also to equip us for fellowship with God. The program of Christianity is not only "forgetting the things which are behind," but also "stretching forward to the things which are before;" we must "press on toward the goal unto the

[7] Rom. 5. 20.

prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."[8] The goal of Christianity is to bring men into perfect communion with God. This fellowship can be realized only when "we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a fullgrown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ."[9] Only those who are Christlike can have perfect fellowship with God, and through sanctification we can attain to the likeness of Christ.

Its Operation and Results. Sanctification is possible only in the lives of those who seek after fellowship with God and who have accepted Christ as the ideal of their lives. Only when the master sentiment of a life is for perfect relationship through him to God and when all the other sentiments, which determine courses of thought or action, are grouped around this master sentiment, can the individual be said to be sanctified. He may sublimate his impulses in seeking to become a useful member of society or to attain a certain standard of morality, but these impulses are sanctified only as they are expressed in activity which relates the individual to God through Christ.

When Christ has been accepted as the Lord

[8] Phil. 3. 13, 14.
[9] Eph. 4. 13.

of the life and perfect relationship with God through him has come to be the master sentiment, all other sentiments become co-ordinated in their expression to help toward the realization of the master sentiment. The perfection of Christ is accepted as the ego ideal and all the impulses arising out of the unconscious are expressed according to that ideal, not so much to save the individual from the evils of disintegration which would result from the repression or the unrestricted exercise of the impulses, as to realize Christlikeness in the self. This activity is more than sublimation, for it leads the individual not only to integration within himself and harmony with his environment; it also leads him toward the perfection of holiness and communion with God. This activity is sanctification in operation.

The results of sanctification are abundant life for the individual and the kingdom of God for humanity.

I have said that the program of Christianity is to save man from sin and to save him for God. This is the program of Christianity because it was the purpose of Christ. His own proclamation of the purpose of the incarnation was, "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly."[10] His plan for

[10] John 10. 10.

its realization was contained in his statement that "Whosoever will save his life shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it."[11] We have seen that to save one's libido by forbidding it expression or to expend it prodigally without relation to an ego ideal, is to lose its power as an aid to integration. But when an individual is "lost" in a master sentiment for a particular life purpose, true integration of personality comes with the sublimation of the libido in activity which will aid in the realization of the life purpose, and new "life" is found. What is true of the sublimation of psychic activity in accomplishing the integration of the personality is, to a much greater degree, true of the effect of sanctification in the perfecting of the soul. If a man can "lose" himself in Christ, the result is the sanctification of all of the phases of his life. His energy is no longer wasted in activity which is unrelated to the ultimate goal of his life. Everything he does is an aid to the realization of that goal. Abundant life for him means life that is spent in fellowship with God. By "losing" his lite in Christ he becomes like Christ, and able to experience that fellowship.

Sanctification will also result in the kingdom

[11] Matt. 16. 25.

of God for mankind. For, with the power of the herd instinct operative in group life and with every individual "tending to be followed" by the other members of his group, those who become sanctified will exert an influence for good upon those whom they touch, and their goodness will leaven the lump of our humanity until all shall bow at the foot of the cross of Christ, and all men shall seek to become Christlike.

Some have claimed that psychoanalysis has unlocked the door to greater glory for mankind, but Christianity has always held the key. The same principles which have been the foundation upon which Christianity has been built have been applied by the psychoanalysts in the direction of psychical activities toward more satisfactory individual and group life. But they have limited the application of those principles to helping man to harmony within himself and in his environment. The same principles have been applied further by Christianity, to bring man to a proper relationship not only with that which is human but that which is divine, not only with that which is, but that which ought to be. Thus there is no real conflict between the new psychology and Christianity. Psychoanalysis has merely added the weight of its evidence to the eternal truths originally revealed in the life and teaching of Jesus.

Penn #28

Date Due

FACULTY		
NOV [illegible]		
[illegible]		
[illegible]		
[illegible]		
[illegible]		
JAN 4 '65		
DEC 7 '66		
[illegible]		
[illegible]		
[illegible]		
[illegible]		
[illegible]		
FEB [illegible]		
[illegible]		
[illegible]		
MAY 15 2009		


Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01014 4931